

14

*

THE
SEAT OF GOVERNMENT
OF
CANADA,
ITS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,
AND
“DOUBLE MAJORITY” QUESTION.

THIS much vexed point has again become one of the leading questions of the day. (1843.) No measure of colonial legislation, however important, either proceeding from the Home Government, or originating in the Colony, has been treated with so much importance, or agitated with so much warmth, as the question of the permanent locality of the Capital of Canada,—if the measure of that importance and that warmth be taken from the degree of rancour and scurrility which seems to have influenced the contending parties. The subject has been universally discussed, in Upper Canada at least, with that indecent heat which ever betrays the predominance of selfish interests over reason and principle. The imaginations of the different disputants have been extremely fertile in the invention of reasons in favor of their own particular localities; and hence no subject has ever been discussed with a more slavish adherence to sectional interests, nor a more barefaced disregard of the merits of the question in the abstract. The advocates of each rival locality exaggerate its real or supposed superiority in regard to some one point, which, either from instinct or necessity, they treat as the sole essential requisite,—the *sine qua non* of the question, to be considered to the exclusion of all other advantages,—disdaining, or more probably not daring to put the question on its true basis, and dispassionately to enquire,—what place or city in Canada possesses the greatest combination of all the essential requisites for the permanent location of the seat of Government.

The simple question is :—Which is the most advantageous place in Canada, for the permanent establishment of its seat of Government, *all things considered*?—In order to arrive at a sound and impartial conclusion, let it first be ascertained what are the main points to be considered in making the selection, without reference to any particular locality.—The great requisites for the Capital of Canada would seem to present themselves in the following order :—

- 1o. Security from foreign invasion.
- 2o. Easy and rapid communication with the Metropolitan State in peace and in war.
- 3o. Centrality.
- 4o. Salubrity.

50. The possession of public buildings affording suitable accommodation for the sittings of the Legislature and the residence of the Governor General, together with the necessary Government offices, or the greatest facility for their erection on an economical plan.

60. Permanency of eligibility of situation in respect of centrality of territory and population.

The foregoing points are given in the order of their estimated importance, after the most mature consideration of the subject, although that order may be deemed an arbitrary one, and may differ according to the opinions and judgment of different persons; but the enumerated requisites must indubitably enter all, more or less, into a fair consideration of the matter at issue, which can only be accurately determined by some similar process of reasoning, in order to keep the enquirer within rational bounds, and to wean him from the influence of his partiality for particular localities. It is obvious that the three first,—Security,—Facility of communication with England,—and Centrality,—are the most essential. The other three—Salubrity,—Public Buildings, and Permanency of Centrality,—though by no means to be overlooked, are yet secondary in importance when compared with the three first.

In the consideration of the above heads the application will be restricted to Toronto, Kingston, Montreal and Quebec, taking it for granted that the small though flourishing Towns of Hamilton, Brockville, Bytown, Sherbrooke, Three Rivers and Carlisle, are deemed by universal consent to be totally ineligible, unless indeed in the opinion of the patriotic and ambitious inhabitants of the little Town of Bytown.—Let us then take up the rival Cities in this game, and make them run the gauntlet of the foregoing assumed requisite qualifications.

TORONTO.

With reference to the first of these Cities the determination is quickly and easily come to.—Toronto is palpably deficient in almost all the requisites.

10. *Security from Foreign invasion.*—It is utterly defenceless and indefensible.

20. *Communication with England.*—It is too far inland and consequently inaccessible from the sea. It has no secure means of communication with the Mother Country in war, while on the other hand it is in too close proximity to a powerful and grasping people, who "reckon" that "the whole boundless continent is theirs."

30. *Centrality.*—It is situate near one, and the weaker extremity of the Province. The annexed Table has been formed for the purpose of affording some idea, approximately, of the relative centrality of most of the Capitals and Cities of the world.—The figures in the column styled "Rate of Centrality," denote the *deficiency* of each on this head, estimated from one to one hundred degrees.—one degree implying that a City so situated is almost perfectly central, while one hundred degrees indicate its situation to be at the extremity of the country.—Thus Toronto, as the Capital of the late Province of Upper Canada, is only deficient 8-100ths. in centrality, or eight per cent removed from the centre of that country, which is calculated, as well as the other Cities and Towns of Canada, with reference to the course of the St. Lawrence, the best criterion under present circumstances; although the rates of all the other Cities and Towns have been estimated geographically. Toronto as the Capital of Canada, it will be seen, is thirty two per cent deficient on this point, and is therefore by no means central.

40. *Salubrity.*—Its situation is sufficiently salubrious.

50. *Public Buildings.*—It possesses some public buildings, but they are insufficient for the accommodation of the Legislature of the United Province, and would diminish, in a comparatively small amount, the necessary expenditure for the erection of sufficient buildings.

60. *Permanency of eligibility.*—It is only in the event of any one place possessing, at the present moment, a decided preponderance in the assumed requisite

qualifications, that the permanency of its eligibility need be discussed. Toronto is now, and likely to continue, greatly deficient in most of these; and it would therefore be idle to argue speculatively upon any advantage which it may be supposed hereafter to acquire from adventitious causes, arising out of an increased population in that section of the Province,—or otherwise.

The painful conclusion is then inevitable,—that Toronto, save in the opinion of the high minded inhabitants of that Tory City, is excluded from any just pretension to be the Capital of Canada.

KINGSTON.

Next in order comes the Town of Kingston, and its boisterous pretensions to a preference, predicated, it is presumed, upon its possessing the requisite qualifications, in a higher degree than any town or city of Canada.

1o. *Security from foreign invasion.*—Kingston is a fortified town, and sufficiently strong to bid defiance to surrounding nations in the piping times of peace, but by no means formidable in the event of a war. It is situate on the borders of Lake Ontario, the waters of which are navigated by us in common with a foreign Power ambitious of naval superiority, and not to be contemned. It may be bombarded in summer from the Lake, and reduced to ashes in a few hours. It may be approached by 100,000 men across the ice in winter,—invested and taken, whilst its metropolitan-minded inhabitants are slumbering in fancied security. A serious, and by no means impracticable project of this nature, was on foot during the last American war, and the “sympathising” inhabitants of the opposite frontier, during the last insurrection, made no secret of their intentions to storm the fortified city of the Lake, with a small band of their loafing ragamuffins.

2o. *Communication with England.*—Without being so far inland as Toronto, the site of the good town of Kingston is sufficiently remote from sea navigation to render it extremely difficult, if not impossible, in time of war, to keep up an uninterrupted communication between it and the mother country. We could not have a more striking instance of this difficulty than the fact that a few plundering “Patriots” from the “land of liberty,” packed in a windmill at Prescott, and the smuggler, Bill Johnson, lurking amidst the “Thousand Islands,” were sufficient to interrupt or render dangerous the navigation of the St. Lawrence. And there are many points between Kingston and Quebec as strong as Navy Island, from which an enemy, however otherwise contemptible, might do incalculable mischief before he could be dislodged.

3o. *Centrality.*—Kingston, by the Table, is shown to be twenty per cent deficient in centrality, and although preferable to Toronto, is inferior in this respect to all its other contending rivals.

4o. *Salubrity.*—Of all the localities now in agitation for the honor of the Capital, Kingston is the most unhealthy. * Already have two Governors General succumbed under the pestiferous influence of its climate, who, in more favoured localities, might have long preserved their lives and their usefulness.

5o. *Public Buildings.*—It has no buildings whatever suited to the wants of a Capital. It is true that it has a valuable swamp upon which the necessary edifices may be constructed at an enormous expense. It is equally true that they may be burned down by the Americans in one night, and the vanity of the Kingstonians gratified by the erection of new and more improved models of architecture, and their “deserted village” thus greatly embellished at the expense of the Province.

6o. *Permanency of eligibility.*—Of the six assumed requisite qualifications, Kingston claims to possess one in a high degree, namely, the probability of its increased centrality at some future period. Should the tide of emigration continue always to flow westward, and the pretensions of Kingston be tested by this prospective advantage as the principal requisite, regardlessly of every other, then indeed the inhabitants of the Midland District might have had some reason to suppose that

* (1856.)

Lord Syhenham's choice of Kingston for the Canadian Capital was based upon some inherent claim to superiority, unconnected with any *ruse* to reconcile the Upper Canadians to the Union, or "to let that country down easy." The colonization, however, of the extensive and fertile regions bordering upon the River Saguenay and Lake St. John, and the contemplated establishment of a wealthy and powerful company to promote the inexhaustible fisheries of Gaspé Bay, may render the lower districts of the St. Lawrence the most populous, the most wealthy and the most important in the Province. But in the absence of any increase in the population of the lower extremity of the Province, from these or any other sources, it must be admitted that Kingston is more likely to possess, hereafter, this single quality of centrality in a higher degree than any other; provided always—that the politicians of that portion of the Province do not become more inoculated with Republicanism, and consequently disaffected towards monarchical institutions; which possible contingency would render the future problematical centrality of Kingston, clogged as it is with many other defects,—utterly valueless.

MONTREAL.

We must now subject "the favored City of Canada" to the same test:—

10. *SECURITY FROM INVASION.*—The Island City's pretensions to security from invasion, foreign or domestic, are so meager, that it is unnecessary to discuss them. It may merely be observed *en passant*, that it is within less than twenty-four hours march of the same colossal and grasping power already adverted to;—that the proximity of its unique mountain, (in the hands of an enemy,) renders its position worse than defenceless, and that the possession of this eminence, which may be acquired by one night's forced march, would hold the Capital of the Canadas,—the two Branches of the Legislature (were they in session,) and the Representative of the British Crown, in a most delectable state of submission;—possibly with no other means than the redoubtable Doric Club at their command to retake the mountain;—and we should then again witness the humiliating spectacle of the Governor General of British North America, like Lord Dorchester, escaping in disguise in a frail canoe to Quebec for personal safety.

20. *Communication with Great Britain.*—The situation of Montreal, though not so much inland as Kingston, is still obnoxious to the same formidable objection, that it would not be easy to keep up a communication between it and the Metropolitan state in time of war, for any practicable purpose.—Having no bulwarks of its own, it is as much beyond the protection of "England's bulwarks" both in winter and summer, as Penetanguishine on the borders of Lake Huron; added to this—that the naval supremacy of Great Britain would be totally ineffectual as respects Montreal, by reason of the inability of that City to hold out for one day.

30. *Centrality.*—As regards centrality, Montreal has the highest pretension of all, with reference to population or territorial extent, its deficiency in this respect being only *five* per cent by the table. Tested by the centrality which is based upon the facility of communication, or travel between the two extremities of the Province, the merits of Montreal suffer some diminution, as will be shown hereafter.

40. *Salubrity.*—In this particular the situation of Montreal is superior to that of Kingston, and inferior to that of Quebec. It is sufficiently healthy to obviate all objection to its climate, and occasionally sufficiently unhealthy to preclude the possibility of its claiming pre-eminence on that score.

50. *Public Buildings.*—Montreal has no public buildings whatever adapted for the sittings of the Legislature, or the residence of the Governor General; nor does it possess any suitable public property within the City available for the uses of the Government,—the "Report" of Her Majesty's Canadian Executive to the contrary notwithstanding. If so,—where does it exist in sufficient extent, without the demolition of other useful public buildings which must be elsewhere rebuilt at an enormous cost. The oft reiterated and idle boast of the superiority of Montreal as a great—flourishing—commercial city has, if true, no other bearing on the question of the Seat of Government, than the proportionate augmentation which it must ne-

cessarily cause in the price of the ground to be purchased for the erection of public buildings.

60. *Permanency of eligibility.*—The present eligibility, or ineligibility of the sister City of Lower Canada is not likely to be much affected, either favorably or unfavorably, by the future condition of the Province—Its centrality, as to population, may possibly be enhanced by the amelioration and peopling of the fertile regions to its southward,—*bien entendu*,—that the defection of the votaries of republicanism forms no part of the vista.

QUEBEC.

Last, (and certainly not least) comes the consideration of the ancient Capital of the Canadas, the merits and demerits of which shall be tested with all the fairness and impartiality which can be expected from a citizen of that place. If the judgment of our modern Provincial Statesmen be to be adopted, the discussion may be fruitless. Its abandonment, however, shall not be sealed without one voice being raised in its favor; and should the various qualifications herein assumed be the true orthodox tests, we shall presently see how immeasurably Quebec outstrips the boasted advantages of its pigmy rivals, as well in the number of those qualifications as in the weight and value to be legitimately ascribed to each. The object of the writer is to establish, upon just principles, its infinite superiority over Toronto, Kingston and Montreal; and although he does not assume the character of a judge, pronouncing, in measured terms, and with affected coolness, upon the comparative deserts of each competitor, it is nevertheless to be hoped, that, divested of any colouring which prejudice or a partiality for Quebec may impart to the discussion, enough will still be left to convince the disinterested and dispassionate enquirer, that that city possesses unanswerable claims to a preference—to be, as it has hitherto been, the Seat of Government of the Canadas, and as such—the metropolis of the British possessions in North America.

10. *Security from invasion.*—The commanding heights and frowning battlements of Quebec sufficiently attest the justice of its claim to be styled the second fortress on the globe. Nature has done more for it than art, and science, and wealth combined can ever do for any other city or town in Canada. It is a great stronghold marked out by nature as a site for the Capital of a great country, and rendered impregnable by a lavish expenditure of the wealth of the British nation. Its high character in this respect will be conceded by its most inveterate opponents; it is only the degree of importance to be attached to this qualification which they will attempt to call in question. It would be well, however, for those who now sing the praises of Montreal in disparagement of Quebec, to remember that we have the best evidence of the opinion of the inhabitants of the former as to the comparative value of the two cities in point of security, in the well authenticated historical fact, that on the outbreak in 1837 the banking Institutions of Montreal were glad to remove the contents of their coffers to Quebec for safe keeping; and further, that the General commanding the Forces in Canada at that period, with his staff, were ready—bag and baggage—to fly to Quebec, on the first intimation of any reverse being sustained by Colonel Weatherall, who was sent out to subdue a small band of undisciplined insurgents in the District of Montreal.

20. *Communication with the mother country.*—It has an easy and rapid communication with the United Kingdom during seven months of the year. It is accessible to the largest ships of the line, and the whole British navy may ride in safety under its walls.—Its means of communication in winter lie through British territory, and are therefore incomparably superior to those of the other cities, whose only direct route is through a foreign country.

30. *Centrality.*—It is more central than either Toronto or Kingston, and less central than Montreal, regard being had to territorial extent or population. Its rate by the Table is minus *ten*,—that is, within one of the city of Madrid, the most central capital of any note in the world.—But of this more anon.

40. *Salubrity*.—In regard to this qualification Quebec bears the palm. Its elevated position in the midst of a mountainous country ensures it a continuance of refreshing breezes, and the salubrity of its climate is doubly enhanced by the grandeur of the surrounding scenery, which is unsurpassed by that of any country in the world.

50. *Public Buildings*.—Its advantages as to the fifth qualification have been attempted to be underrated by the very impartial supporters of Montreal. Quebec possesses spacious accommodations for the sittings of the Legislature, erected on a magnificent scale, consisting one half—or rather more than one half—of an elegant new edifice built on the site of a portion of the old Palace of the Catholic Bishop, and appropriated for the Hall and Offices of the Legislative Assembly,—the other half, or rather less than the half—of the remains of the same Palace, which have been occupied by the Legislative Council and the Offices attached to it, and which were in progress of being replaced by a continuation of the new buildings upon the same elegant scale, when the political dissensions in Lower Canada put a speedy period to all legislation.*—The completion of this superb edifice could not necessitate an expenditure of more than a tenth of what must be incurred in the purchase of the ground, and the erection of the necessary buildings in Montreal or Kingston. The want of a suitable residence for the Governor General is common to all,—with this difference in favor of Quebec,—that it already possesses spacious grounds for that object, commanding one of the finest prospects on this continent.

60. *Permanency of eligibility*.—With respect to the permanency of the present eligibility of Quebec, it must depend upon the course of events.—Should the country to its southward and westward become very populous, and retain its allegiance to the British Crown, the centrality of Quebec will be diminished in the ratio of the increase of the population of the south over that of the north.—Should, however, our anticipations in either of these respects prove fallacious, Quebec will then have lost nothing in importance; and should it be found necessary hereafter to unite the whole of the British North American Provinces, it will, under such circumstances, become eminently central; and the lavish expenditure of the Public Revenue, in the erection of buildings in localities which will have ceased to be central, or the inhabitants whereof shall have transferred their allegiance to a foreign Power, will then be pronounced to have been an act of egregious—irretrievable folly.

Such are the merits and demerits of the City of Quebec and of the three other aspirants for the honor of the Seat of Government.

In further prosecuting the enquiry as to which of the localities in question has the strongest claim to a preference, it may be taken for granted, on the only sound principles which must and ought to govern the choice, that no one requisite is of such paramount importance as to determine the point, in the absence or to the exclusion of every other. In default of any one candidate for the honor uniting all the requisites, it must then be ascertained which possesses the majority in number, or the preponderance in value of the given tests. Assuming the foregoing six qualifications to be the true tests,—namely, Security from invasion,—Facility of communication with the Mother Country,—Centrality,—Salubrity,—Public Buildings,—and Permanency of eligibility,—it has been abundantly shewn that Toronto is preeminent in the exiguity of its pretensions to the principal requisites, and that its claim to be the Capital of the new Province could only rest upon the possession of a few public buildings,—together with a sufficiently healthy locality,—a quality very beneficial to the inhabitants of that city, and one in which it rejoices in common with the *Grands Capumets* and the Isle of Anticosti.—It has also been made evident that Kingston cannot boast of the possession of one single qualification in a sufficient degree to entitle its claim to be considered at all, unless we except its prospect of becoming, at some future day, more central as to population.

* Since burned down.

But any claim to a preference on this score has been for ever frustrated by the folly of its founders, in not having better provided for the health of the embryo Metropolis. The clamorous pretensions of the Kingstonians seem to be founded upon a total want of every other merit than a furtive possession of two years, vouchsafed to it by Lord Sydenham with a view (as it is said,) "to let Upper Canada down easy," and probably to counteract the effect of the declarations attributed to him in other quarters, "that it was quite preposterous to think of that mud-hole Kingston being the permanent Capital of Canada."

The choice then is between Quebec and Montreal,—Quebec richly endowed with every essential requisite, except centrality,—Montreal highly objectionable in every point of view, save always its vaunted centrality. It will form an important element in the consideration to ascertain the value of this attribute upon which alone the sister city rests her claim. In determining this point the lights derived from experience, and from the existing condition of the Capitals of the various States and Sovereignities of the World, more particularly of representative Europe and Republican America, in which popular institutions have obtained the sway, must not and cannot be slighted, without a wanton disregard of the results of history, and the respect due to the opinions of the majority of mankind. If the arguments in favor of centrality, as a *sine quâ non*, are to be borne out by the practice of other countries, recourse must be had to the constitutional Governments of Europe, and the Republics of democratic America, for examples in support of the proposition. If these furnish no data to bear them out, the flimsy superstructure erected upon this foundation must crumble to the ground. The results exhibited by the annexed table by no means tend to enhance the value of a central position, much less to determine its being the primary object in pointing out the best locality for the seat of the Government of a country.

The rate of centrality,—or rather the average deficiency in centrality, of the different countries enumerated in the Table, is as follows:—

The Capitals of British America are 23 degrees removed from the centres of their respective territories, or 23 per cent deficient in centrality,	23	"
Those of the United States,	30	"
Europe,	30	"
Africa,	34	"
Central America,	36	"
Asia,	39	"
South America,	46	"

The average deficiency of the whole is..... 31 "

Of forty-six European Capitals, *seven* only are central cities!

Of ten British American Capitals, two are central!

Of thirty United States Capitals, ten only are central.—*Three* are more central than Quebec, and *twenty-seven* less central; and their principal Capitals, such as Washington, Boston, Providence, Albany, Richmond and New Orleans are far from being central.

Of the eleven Capitals of Central and South America, not one is central.

The average deficiency in centrality of the Capitals of the States of Europe enjoying constitutional Governments is 29, while that of the Capitals of the States under the sway of despotism is only 28.

The deficiency of Quebec as the Capital of Canada is only 10, while that of the Capitals of Europe and the United States is 30, and of all those enumerated in the Table 31.

Of all the Capitals of Europe, the hapless City of Madrid alone is central,—a prey to all its enemies, whether foreign or domestic,—the worthy prototype of the "Island City of the French,"!—"the favored City of Canada,"!—and a lasting monument of the profound wisdom of a central situation, shorn of every other requisite. Among the great Capitals of the world we find that Madrid is again the most central City; that Amsterdam, Berlin, (as the Capital of modern Prussia,) Pekin

(of the Chinese Empire) Constantinople, (of the Turkish Empire,) Lisbon and Copenhagen, are only partially central,—their deficiencies ranging from 19 to 26 per cent;—while Dublin, Vienna (Austrian Empire), Mexico, New Orleans, Naples, and Washington, nearly all of which are great commercial marts, and under the rule of popular institutions, are far from being central, their distances from their respective territorial centres varying from 29 to 33 per cent. But the following Capitals, among which are the greatest and most populous cities on the globe, and the great majority of which belong to countries enjoying constitutional governments, namely Paris, Edinburgh, Warsaw, (old Poland,) London, Boston, Stockholm, St. Petersburg, Berlin, (old Prussia,) Frankfort upon Maine, Pekin, (China Proper) and Rio Janeiro, seem to have been placed, and to have grown to their present colossal grandeur, in localities indicating the utmost contempt for the shadowy advantage called centrality. These little worlds have continued to be the seats of their respective Governments, whether constitutional or despotic, in defiance of the political changes and revolutions which many of them have undergone, although situate at points closely bordering on the confines of their several dominions;—thus affording striking illustrations of the little regard which has been paid to, and the little advantage derived from centrality. There is an additional and a remarkable feature in the position of these great commercial capitals of the world, which has a strong bearing upon the question at issue, and is destructive of the pretensions of the advocates of mere territorial centrality. The Cities of Amsterdam, Berlin, Pekin, Constantinople, Lisbon, Copenhagen, Dublin, Vienna, New Orleans, Naples, Paris, Edinburgh, London, Boston, Stockholm, St. Petersburg and Rio Janeiro, seem to owe their origin, their wealth, magnificence and permanent locality as Capitals, to their vicinity to water communications, and their great facility of intercourse with foreign nations; or in other words—to their *external* or *international* centrality,—utterly regardless of *internal*.

The Capital elect of Canada is said to be endowed in a high degree with this virtue of geographical centrality, limited to the course of the St. Lawrence; and if, denuded of every other requisite, the sister City of the nether Province is to have its claim tested by this single property, then indeed it can only yield the palm to the good town of Three Rivers, which is still more central, nearer to sea navigation, and infinitely more salubrious. But if, on the contrary, the essential requisites for the permanent establishment of the Canadian Capital be *all* taken into consideration, and the choice awarded to that one which possesses a preponderance of advantages, Quebec is incomparably superior to all its rivals. Strongly contrasting with the other three, which can scarcely boast each of the possession of one solitary requisite, Quebec possesses, in an eminent degree, four of the necessary qualifications, namely, Security, Freedom of communication with the Parent state, Salubrity, and Public Buildings, all of which give the City of Cape Diamond an overwhelming preponderance over her less favored competitor,—“the Island City of the French,” even were Quebec more deficient in centrality than it is represented or supposed to be.

But since the ancient Capital of the Canadas is undervalued, in the eyes of Her Majesty's Canadian Executive, by reason of its want of centrality, it would be well to ascertain what is the precise ratio of its deficiency in this particular. Centrality, properly considered, embraces three points—

First—Centrality in respect to territorial extent. Secondly—Centrality in respect of population. Thirdly—Centrality in respect to facility of communication, or access to and from the other parts of the Province.

In regard to the first, or territorial centrality, Quebec is about 125 miles distant from the navigable or arterial centre, which at the present day, and for a century to come, will be the true one, and is therefore deficient to that small extent. By the table its defect is represented by *ten*. That of Montreal by five; and the difference between the two on this head is so trifling, that so slight an advantage cannot weigh a feather in the general balance.

As to the second, or the centrality of population, Quebec is certainly second

to Montreal, the mass of the population of Canada being found to the southward.

But with respect to the third, or the centre both of territory and population, regard being had to the facility of communication, or distance measured by the time required to overcome it, the rank to be assigned to Quebec, as a central position, must precede that of all the others.—This is obviously the main consideration,—the only genuine and rational test to be applied to the question of centrality. It is idle to reason about the centre of territory or population, without measuring both by the facilities of communication or the means of travel. Steam annihilates distance, and any theory which excludes that important element of speed, is but an improper argument to obtain an improper end,—a mere imposture. If it were required to determine the most central point for the location of a Capital in a country divided by a lofty range of Alps or Appenines, and having one-tenth part of its population on one side, inhabiting an extent of one hundred miles, and the remaining nine-tenths on the other side, occupying an extent of nine hundred miles, ;—and further that the larger plane, intersected by rail-roads, were traversable in cushioned cars in twenty-four hours, while it would require a week to accomplish the other distance,—would it be consistent with reason, common sense, or “equal justice,” to place the capital of that land at its geographical centre? Would not the true centre—that point which would be equally central for all its inhabitants,—all things considered,—incline greatly towards the range of mountains and the smaller plane? Would it not be unjust, on the part of the rulers of that country, towards one portion of its inhabitants, to choose the *Montreal* of the territorial centre, as the fittest place for a Capital, by reason of its being a supposed greater *mart for trade*? And how would such a shallow argument be strengthened by descanting, as in the Report of the Canadian Executive, on the dissimilarity of the habits and customs of different portions of the same land—and contrasting the “strangeness” of the appearance of the transalpine *Dos blancs* and their City,—with the simplicity of the Sawmies and Jonathans of the Cisalpine region!!!—Would not such a choice be deemed an act of gross injustice, and such reasoning a mockery!!

Yet such is the state of the question respecting the rival merits of Quebec and Montreal in respect of centrality. The distance from Quebec to the Lower extremity of the Province, in round numbers, is 500 miles, and its distance from the Upper extremity is about 750. The time required to travel either distance, in summer or in winter, according to the present mode of conveyance, is greater as regards the Lower extremity than the Upper, and is likely to continue so for a period which will outlive the allegiance of the inhabitants of either section to the British Crown. If the inhabitants of the lower region, numbering about 200,000, be entitled to a participation of that “equal justice,” which is the clap-trap of the present day, a due regard must be had to their facility of communicating with the seat of legislation and of the administrative Machine. If the inhabitants of Gaspé, a populous and flourishing district, encounter greater hardships and require a longer time to make known their wants to the Government, supposing it to be situate at Quebec, than the inhabitants of the Western District; and that the present relation and circumstances of the two sections be likely to continue the same for a long period to come, then Quebec is decidedly the most central point for the seat of the Provincial Government, upon the only true and rational grounds by which centrality can be tested.

The report of the Canadian Executive dwells with a tone of infinite confidence and satisfaction upon the great advantages Montreal possesses as a site for the Canadian Capital, grounded upon its being a large, flourishing and wealthy City, and the supposed centre of an extensive trade. It would be difficult to comprehend upon what principle its commercial importance could ensure it a preference, were it built in Gaspé Bay, or at the extremity of the Western District; surely, at either of these points no precedence could be awarded to it on that ground which is obviously extraneous to the main question. The claim of Montreal to superiority, if any it have, must rest on other and intrinsic advantages, namely, its boasted cen-

trality, which great attribute is no doubt prodigiously enhanced by the statesman-like argument of Her Majesty's Colonial advisers, that Quebec and its people would appear, "strange" to the single-minded, unsophisticated denizens of Upper-Canada, and that for that reason they could never think of subjecting the hypochondriacal temperaments of the latter to the suicidal effects of such a contact!! What particular bearing this unfortunate blemish in the physiognomy and circumstances of the people of Quebec has upon the question, they have not condescended to show, nor has the degree of weight which has been given to it in Downing Street as yet transpired.

Again, (says the Report,) "*the Island of Montreal was chosen as the site of a great City by the French Government in the early times of the colony*"—*Certes—"the acknowledged sagacity and foresight displayed by the officers of that nation in their selection of positions for either civil or military occupation,"*—which is so much admired in the said Report,—is at this day amply borne out by two important facts,—namely—that the Executive Council of Canada agree in opinion with the officers of that celebrated colonizing nation upon the eligibility of Montreal "*as a position for civil or military occupation!*" and that the French have been driven almost from every inch of ground which they possessed on this continent!!

Admidst the host of trashy reasons which have been attempted to be palmed upon the British ministry for the purpose of adding to the fancied embellishments of "the favoured City of Canada," there is one with respect to which all badinage must be put aside, and which, if it had any foundation in fact, would give considerable weight to the claims of that City. Montreal is represented to be "*situate at the head of navigation from the sea, and at the foot of the river and canal navigation, not only of Canada, but of North Western America.*" This must have been an error on the part either of the printer or of the amanuensis employed by the Council. If the words—"for Montreal read Quebec," had been added in a note, it would have saved the framers of the report from the equivocal position in which this erroneous statement—or typographical or clerical error, has placed them. During the season of navigation, from one thousand to eleven hundred vessels resort annually to the Port of Quebec, of which one hundred to one hundred and fifty, of comparatively inferior burden, are towed to the aforesaid "head of navigation from the sea."—If towing vessels against the strong current of a shallow river of intricate navigation, constitute sea or ship navigation,—then there is some truth in the assertion; and the only remaining difficulty would be,—after the completion of the St. Lawrence and Chamby Canals,—to determine, upon such a criterion, at what particular point, between Montreal and Chicago, the terminus of ship navigation would be found; and it would be equally difficult to show in what way this style of sea or ship navigation could differ from the towage of vessels, over a rail-road, five hundred miles into the interior of the country,—whither the author of the Report on the seat of Government-question, by the same misapplication of terms, might extend the ordinarily received bounds of Old Ocean and "astonish his weak nerves" by landing him amidst the primeval pines of the Canadian forest. Could the framers of this statistical deception have possibly imagined that Lord Stanley, or the other Members of the British Cabinet, are not as well acquainted as any man in Canada with the depth of water, and the nature of the navigation of every foot of the river St. Lawrence between Quebec and Montreal? The man who penned the assertion in question must have known, that *Quebec*, and *Quebec* alone—was the termination of sea or ship navigation, and—conversely, the commencement of inland or steam navigation. Any statement in disparagement of the marked position of the City of Quebec in this respect, was a deviation from fact, unpardonable in individuals whose accession to power is predicated upon their supposed intimate knowledge of all the circumstances of the country submitted to their rule.

But it may be answered that the discussion of the relative merits of the different sites above mentioned is now idle, in as much as the Home Ministry, in the exercise of the Royal Prerogative, have restricted the choice to Kingston and Montreal, and that having deferred to the Provincial Legislature as to the selection to

be made between the two, a decision has been come to in favor of Montreal which is irrevocable. It will be necessary to combat this new feature of the case, which would seem to exclude the Gibraltar of the American continent from any consideration whatever in the choice of the future Capital of the Canadas, before it can be shewn that the present discussion of the question can lead to any beneficial result. The expression of an opinion by the Legislature has only been given under a limited choice between Kingston and Montreal, and so far its decision entails no sentence of condemnation upon Quebec.—The submission of the point to the decision of the Legislature of two lately United Provinces, composed of heterogeneous and discordant elements, and differing so widely in languages, laws, and religion, before the separate identity of each section of the new Province or its individual interests could possibly be lost sight of in the minds of their respective deputies, or amalgamated, as they ought to be—with the entirety of the Province as a common country;—and at a time too when every disturbing influence which could in the least affect the flimsy cicatrice of the recent revolt, ought to have been carefully eschewed,—was a blunder which may be attended with disastrous results. But it was an infinitely greater blunder to require the expression of an opinion at the hands of the Legislature, as the supposed best judges of their local affairs and circumstances, in respect to the most suitable place for a Canadian Capital,—and at the same time to direct that choice, and to restrict it to one of two localities. The reference to the Legislature was tantamount to an admission of want of sufficient information and means of judging on the part of the Ministry, and was deferential to the Representatives of the people. The exclusion of Quebec and Toronto from their consideration was, on the other hand, an assumption of a higher degree of knowledge on the part of the ministry, which was destructive of the wisdom of the reference and of its deferential character.—It was “*donner et retenir*”—a *gaucherie*—and an anomaly, which could only have been the result of the unwise communications on this subject which have crossed the Atlantic from either side, and which are now prudently veiled from the light of day. But at all events the opinion required, and that which ought to have been given on a point of this nature, was a free and unbiassed expression of the sense of the Legislature as upon an open question, not the echo of the previously pronounced opinion of an office—dispensing administration, or the judgment of a stipendiary House.—For these reasons, then, the decision of the Legislature is deprived of all moral influence.

Again the Executive Government have egregiously mistaken their position in relation to this question. They have treated it as an act of ephemeral administration, and as such coming within the legitimate scope of their control as responsible advisers of the Crown; while, on the contrary, it was a question of permanent interests, deeply affecting the whole of the Province, and not at all dependent upon any principle of political economy, or of the science of Government, and one totally unconnected with the ascendancy of any one party in the state, whether French or English, Tory, Reformer, Radical or Destructive. It was an unwarrantable assumption on their part to make it a Cabinet measure, and to throw their influence into the scale in favor of any one locality. The opinion thus extorted cannot, therefore, be deemed to be the free and unrestrained judgment of the Legislature, which the Home Government had a right to expect, and which ought to have been given, and is consequently so much diminished in value as to preclude the possibility of its being taken to be conclusive.

The course pursued by the Executive Government sins also in another respect, which seems to indicate not a too accurate conception of their present footing. The reins of Government have been confided to their hands on the introduction into the colonies of the principle of Responsible Government, a system which was absolutely necessary to give essence to the representative form of government established in Canada, and to impart harmonious action to the constitution, by transferring the administration of the Government from the hands of servile officials, to persons having the confidence of the Representatives of the people; but the practi-

cability of which system, in a colony, rests solely upon a marked line of demarcation being rigidly kept up between questions of an *Imperial*, and those of a *Colonial* or local nature. The least encroachment upon this line will instantly revive the old bug-bear objections of the incompatibility of Responsible Government with colonial dependency; and the "action" (to adopt an Americanism) of the Provincial Executive in this matter, was an act of usurpation in which they have been unadvisedly countenanced by the Colonial Office. The permanent good working of the new Colonial constitution will materially depend upon a careful severance of imperial and colonial measures, as well as upon mutual forbearance in working out a system, in which each of the *dramatis personæ*, instead of pertinaciously insisting upon the uncontrolled exercise of the particular prerogative or power entrusted to him by his Sovereign, will strive to co-operate cordially with the other servants of the constitution for the general good, holding their *absolute* powers in abeyance, to be exercised only when a jarring of the elements may necessitate a change.

The permanent establishment of the seat of Government of the most important of the British North American possessions, was a question of an Imperial, and not of a Colonial nature; or one at least in which local interests, (if any were involved in it,) were comparatively of so little weight as to become merged in the paramount importance of its imperial character. It was assuredly a question in which a multiplicity of reasons combined to require the decisive and definitive exercise of the prerogative of the Crown by the Home Ministry, in order to prevent that rancorous rivalry and opposition which its reference to the people of the country was sure to produce.

Upon this view of the case then the Provincial Executive have erred—the Colonial Office has erred. That error, not being irremediable, must now be retrieved, and the point deemed undetermined and still open, (notwithstanding the late parliamentary proceedings,) to all the reasons which may be urged in favor of Quebec or any other locality. Moreover the inharmonious manner in which this question has passed through the legislative bodies,—the contradictory addresses of the Legislative Council and Assembly,—the ministerial pressure on both Houses,—the ferment in Upper Canada,—all afford conclusive evidence that the Metropolitan Government is not in a less responsible, but in an infinitely more embarrassed predicament, in relation to this matter, than when they first referred the point.

There is one additional argument in favor of Quebec, which, though forming no part of the abstract merits of the question, it would still be unjust to omit. This City has not only been the Capital of Lower Canada, the most important British possession on this continent, but it was formerly the Capital of the same extent of Territory as the new Province, under the ancient name of the Province of Quebec, and it has always been the seat of the General Government of all the Provinces. The inhabitants under the pledge implied by acts of the supreme authority, have invested their property in that city; and this pledge, under an honest and impartial Government, ought not to be lightly violated. This reason ought to secure to it at least the enjoyment, *ad interim*, of the advantages to be derived from its being the seat of Government, until either the explosion or the complete subsidence of the various elements of discord which still simmer in the land,—afford some prognostic of the future political condition of these valuable appendages of the British Crown.

It is impossible that the British Cabinet, now under the influence of the sound judgment of the most experienced General of the age, can be otherwise than alive to the value of the Citadel of Quebec, as the key to the British possessions in North America. For,—of what avail would be the retention of that stronghold, if the Seat of Government,—the person of the Queen's Representative, and the public documents and records of the country, be placed in a situation in which they may be suddenly paralysed or destroyed, either by the incursions of a neighbouring enemy, or the revolt of the surrounding district? The establishment of the Seat of Government and of the sittings of the Legislature in the midst of a populous district, would in-

evitably draw upon it the attacks of an invading foe, and necessarily cause a needless sacrifice of human life. It ought, therefore, on that ground alone to be avoided, and a situation chosen, affording the best means of defence, and the smallest chance of the destruction of life and property. The defenceless condition of Moscow caused the necessity of applying the torch to that ancient and magnificent capital of the Czars,—a frightful national calamity, from which its *centrality!* afforded it no protection.

The Province of Canada is not in a condition to contemn the advantages to be derived from a fortified city. Placed in the vicinity of a formidable enemy to British supremacy, who claim the whole of the North American continent as their legitimate prey, more especially whatever portion of it is to be found in the possession of Great Britain,—Canada cannot look forward with much confidence to a prolonged peace. The irresponsible rulers of the United States, to wit, the “unwashed” Sovereigns of that lawless land, have always sought and will ever seek every opportunity of embroiling their country in a war with England. All the ranting and blustering about the North Eastern Boundary is again to be enacted in respect of the Oregon Territory; and as the urgency of their demands is ever in the inverse ratio of their rights, the British Government will again be bearded, and bullied into fresh concessions, or else into a sanguinary war in which the disgrace of their recent national bankruptcy and their brazen fraud of their English creditors, will render the “Repudiators” doubly vindictive.

Again, it is the duty of the Parent Government to place the Seat of the Canadian Capital in a position of defence, as well against external, as internal foes. The recent “troubles”, (not to give umbrage,) are fresh in the memory of all. We know not when, nor from what quarter, they may again spring up. The *loyal citizens* of Upper Canada already threaten disaffection on account of the removal of the Seat of Government to Lower Canada. What may we not apprehend when they become inspirited by some less imaginary grievance, and when the year of the “restoration” arrives, and the great agitator is reinstated in his pristine notoriety and political ascendancy, and afforded another opportunity, under the mask of patriotism, of again appearing in the unenviable character of the leader of a lawless horde. The recent union of Lower and Upper Canada is a trial measure, intended as a panacea for the grievances and political dissensions of the two Provinces. It was a measure of necessity which may be eminently successful, or which may signally fail. It is not to be denied that the contiguity of Upper Canada to the neighbouring States along an extended frontier line,—the daily increasing commercial relations of the two countries, and their similarity in language, laws and religion, are fast engendering mutual interests and mutual sympathies, and spreading the leaven of republicanism among the loyal people of Bond Head. The concession of Responsible Government to Canada, though a just and wise measure, is rather calculated to assimilate the working of their respective institutions, and to cause them still more to fraternize; and should perchance, the demagogues of Upper and Lower Canada under its operation ever attain to power, and become restive under the curb which must occasionally be applied by the metropolitan authorities in regard to questions of a mixed Imperial and Colonial nature, fresh and factious agitation and discord may be the result, and a future O’Callaghan or M’Kenzie may spring from the ashes of their hapless ancestors, and produce a collision dangerous to the safety of the United Province,—a consummation neither impossible nor very improbable, and by some devoutly to be wished. It would then become necessary to check the republicanism of the one section and the radicalism of the other, by an infusion of the determined loyalty of the truly British Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, by means of a federal union of all the Provinces. It is obvious that under such circumstances, the City of Quebec would resume its former importance, and become, what the finger of nature has marked it out to be, the capital of a great country. We should then become convinced—nay, convicted of the egregious folly of having established the Seat of Government in a city closely bordering on a foreign state—destitute of every means of defence either

natural or artificial,—requiring a prodigious outlay of public money in an already impoverished country, and with no better justification or apology for the iusensate act than the double sin of having transferred it to such a frail tenement, from a city possessing in an eminent degree every requisite for the site of the Canadian Capital, and as much distinguished for its intrinsic advantages as Montreal is for its absolute want of them.

The gigantic scale of the Parisian fortifications exhibits a striking instance of the opinion of modern times as to the expediency of securing the capital of a monarchical country alike from inward commotion and foreign invasion, and that one of the most enlightened nations of Europe, alive to the lessons of experience, has directed its attention to the strength and safety of its Capital, utterly heedless of its want of centrality. It is in vain to defend the propriety of choosing Montreal as the Seat of Government by reason of its greater centrality; and British statesmen will have but a sorry account to render of their stewardship in awarding it a preference upon this ground alone, while they must be convinced of the fact, that it is but *twelve hours steam* distant from the Gibraltar of North America. * Centrality!—What particular evil or inconvenience has resulted to the many great Capitals of representative Europe, which are situated on the confines of their respective States and Kingdoms, from the want of centrality? Has there ever been a hue and cry raised in those countries upon such a ground? Who ever heard of such a thing, except amidst a few of the mushroom capitals of the mushroom states of the neighbouring Union.

Let it ever be borne in mind, that the connexion of these Colonies with Great Britain can only be co-existent with the naval supremacy of the latter. In vain would England continue to be "Mistress of the seas," as regards the protection of the Canadas from foreign or domestic trouble, unless the Capital be accessible to her navy, and possess all the requisites of a naval station, where "the sleeping thunders of Britain may repose on the bosom of the majestic St. Lawrence." If the lessons of experience have any weight, the examples from the principal capitals of the world hereinbefore enumerated, place the cities of Quebec and Montreal in bold contrast, proving to demonstration the possession by Quebec of all the elements which history seems to indicate as the most conducive to the formation of a great and permanent Capital, while the application of the different essential tests to her rival,—"*the Island City of the French*,"—"*the favoured City of Canada*"—results in a lamentable "*Procès verbal de carence*,"—which would justify the issuing of a commission of lunacy against any man, or set of men, who would attempt to palm such a place on their Sovereign as the most eligible site for a Capital.

Should, however, this act of spoliation or injustice—folly or imprudence, or by whatever name it may be characterized, be now consummated, and that the course of future events do unhappily realize the dark side of the picture herein hinted at, it will but add one more fatal instance to the many to be found in the minutes of English diplomacy and colonial government, in which the earnings of many a hardfought field have been thrown away by the blunders of British Statesmen.

Quebec, 20th November, 1848.

* 1856, five hours !!

KINGDOMS AND STATES.	Population of Kingdoms and States.		CAPITALS.						
	Millions.	Thousands.	Population of Capitals. Thousands.	Rate of Capital as to other Cities same State.	Distance of Capital from the farthest point.	Distance of Capital from the farthest extremity in the opposite direction to the farthest point.	Distance of Capital from nearest point.	Distance of Capital from opposite extremity nearest point.	Rate of deficiency in cen-
AFRICA.									
Egypt,	4	500	Grand Cairo,	300	1	500	120	35	200
Abyssinia,	2	700	Gondar,	50	1	400	200	190	250
Algiers,	2	700	Algiers,	120	1	400	200	0	250
Tunis,	2		Tunis,	130	1	320	60	50	100
Tripoli,	2		Tripoli,	25	1	530	240	0	150
—0—									
AMERICA.									
New Brunswick,		120	Frederickton,	3	2	180	70	50	100
Nova Scotia,		125	Halifax,	20	1	230	150	0	50
Newfoundland,		75	St. John,	15	1	400	60	0	350
Prince Edward Island,		25	Charlotte Town,	2	1	80	60	10	40
Lower-Canada,		600	Quebec,	30	2	500	230	50	
Upper-Canada,		400	Toronto,	5	2	300	220	30	
Canada,			Toronto,	5		1030	220	30	
do.			Kingston,	7	3	880	370	10	
do.			Montreal,	40	1	680	570	35	
do.			Three Rivers,			660	590	100	
do.			Quebec,	30	12	750	500	50	
United States.	15		Washington,	20	0	1800	600	100	500
Maine,		400	Augusta,	4	2	200	100	35	90
New Hampshire,		270	Concord,	4	3	160	35	35	45
Vermont,		280	Montpelier,	2	7	115	55	25	35
Massachusetts,		610	Boston,	65	1	130	80	0	130
Connecticut,		300	Hartford,	10	2	75	50	20	35
do.			New Haven,	11	1	75	45	0	50
Rhode Island,		100	Providence,	17	1	50	12	3	20
do.			Newport,	8	2	40	1	0	40
New-York,	2		Albany,	25	2	310	20	20	310
New Jersey,		320	Trenton,	4	4	100	80	0	40
Pennsylvania,	1	400	Harrisburg,	5	5	210	90	42	100
Delaware,		75	Dover,	2	3	60	50	8	10
Ohio,	1		Columbus,	4	3	200	110	90	120
Indiana,		350	Indianapolis,	1	5	170	150	70	75
Illinois,		160	Vandalia,			200	100	45	60
Missouri,		140	Jefferson City,			210	140	90	200
Maryland,		450	Annapolis,	3	4	180	100	20	60
Virginia,	1	210	Richmond,	16	1	300	80	80	300
Kentucky,		700	Frankfort,	2	4	280	150	40	100
North Carolina,		750	Raleigh,	2	4	320	180	60	140
South Carolina,		600	Columbia,	3	2	150	115	65	140
Georgia,		520	Milledgeville,	14	4	200	180	70	200
Tennessee,		700	Nashville,	6	1	280	200	35	70
Alabama,		310	Tuscaloosa,	2	2	300	250	60	200
Mississippi,		140	Jackson,	2	2	420	220	75	260
Louisiana,		220	New Orleans,	50	1	330	90	40	50
Michigan,		32	Detroit,	9	1	260	50	0	170
Florida,		35	Tallahassee,	1	3	420	190	20	30
Arkansas,		58	Little Rock,			350	320	180	300
Texas,		80	Houston,			900	300	50	900
Mexico,	8		Mexico,	150	1	1500	400	160	200
Guatemala or Central Republic,	2		New Guatemala,	40	1	240	150	50	100
Columbia,	3		Bagota,	50	2	1200	700	230	1200
Brazil,	5		Rio Janeiro,	200	1	230	0	0	230
Peru,	1	700	Lima,	80	1	850	800	0	800
Bolivia,	1	300	Chuquisaca,	30	2	600	550	200	550
United Provinces (Argentine Republic),		800	Buenos Ayres,	80	1	1200	500	100	600
Paraguay,		400	Assumption,	10	1	75	25	0	40
Banda Oriental (Uruguay),		110	Monte Video,	16	1	600	0	0	600
Chili,	1	400	San Jago,	40	1	900	750	75	75

TABLE OF THE PRINCIPAL CAPITAL CITIES IN THE WORLD, SH

KINGDOMS AND STATES.	Population of Kingdoms and States.		CAPITALS.	Population of Capitals. Thousands.	Rate of Capital as to other Cities same State.	Distance of Capital from the farthest point.	Distance of Capital from farthest extremity in the opposite direction to farthest point.	Distance of Capital from nearest point.	Distance of Capital from opposite extremity to nearest point.	Rate of deficiency in centrality—from 1 to 100 dgs.	Distance of Capital from Ship and Steam Navigation.	
	Millions.	Thousands.									Ship.	Steam.
EUROPE.												
Great-Britain and Ireland,	26		London,	1500	1	600	280	50	500	—43	0	0
England	15		London.	1500	1	320	60	50	200	—54	0	0
Scotland,	3		Edinburgh,	170	2	230	110	0	130	—41	0	0
Ireland,	8		Dublin,	220	1	200	150	0	150	—29	0	0
France,	33		Paris,	780	1	500	150	100	250	—37	100	0
Spain,	14		Madrid,	200	1	400	300	160	200	—9		
Portugal,	3	600	Lisbon,	240	1	250	150	20	120	—24	0	0
Italy,	21	150	Rome,	156	3	450	400	15	100	—8	15	0
Naples,	7	640	Naples,	360	1	450	150	0	90	—32	0	0
Papal Dominions,	2	650	Rome,	156	1	250	60	15	30	—33	15	
Lombardy,	4	280	Milan,	140	1	220	20	20	220	—42	80	
Tuscany,	1	300	Florence,	86	1	100	80	30	50	—11	30	
Switzerland,	2	100	Berne,	21	2	150	120	30	70	—13		
			Zurich,			180	100	20	110	—30		
			Lucerne,			150	100	40	90	—20		
Germany,	35		Frankfort,	50	4	700	200	100	500	—50		
Bohemia,	3	800	Prague,	117	1	120	70	55	65	—16		
Moravia & Silesia,	2		Brunn,	36	1	120	70	30	90	—29		
Archduchy of Austria & Salzburg,	2	60	Vienna,	320	1	180	30	20	40	—41		
Tyrol,		800	Innsbruck,			110	60	15	60	—28		
Styria,		860	Graz,	40	1	100	80	25	40	—10		
Illyria,	1	200	Trieste,	40		100	25	0	60	—54	0	0
Pomerania,		900	Stettin,	32		150	100	20	30	—12	0	0
Bavaria,	4	70	Munich,	80	1	200	80	40	100	—32		
Hanover,	1	600	Hanover,	30	2	120	80	15	25	—12		
Wurtemberg,	1	600	Stuttgart,	30		90	70	20	50	—16		
Saxony,	1	500	Dresden,	60	1	90	60	25	30	—12		
Baden,	1	150	Karlsruhe,	20	2	110	80	5	20	—30		
Belgium,	4		Brussels,	80	1	120	80	30	50	—15		
Holland,	2	300	Amsterdam,	210	1	110	100	20	90	—19	0	0
Denmark,	2		Copenhagen,	110	1	250	200	0	190	—26	0	0
Sweden and Norway,	4	200	Stockholm,	85	1	1000	300	0	450	—44	0	0
Austrian Empire,	32		Vienna,	320	1	500	130	130	500	—29		
Hungary,	8	60	Buda,	28	4	300	150	100	250	—34		
Poland (Old,)	15		Warsaw,	130		600	250	150	500	—41		
Prussia (Old,)	13	60	Berlin,	220	1	500	130	50	300	—50		0
Do. (New,)	9	500	Berlin,	220	1	500	400	50	300	—19		
Greece (Modern,)		800	Athens,			150	130	40	120	—18	5	5
Turkey (Europe,)	9		Constantinople,	600	1	700	0	0	700	—100	0	0
Russia (Europe.)	52		St. Petersburg,	450	1	1200	1000	240	900	—20	0	0
—												
Turkish Empire,	21		Constantinople,	600	1	1300	700	20	200	—20	0	0
Russian Empire.	63		St. Petersburg,	450	1	5000	700	240	1500	—49	0	0
—												
ASIA.												
Turkey,	12		Constantinople,	600	1	1300	0	0	1300	—100	0	0
Siberia,	2		Tobolsk,	25	2	3600	500	200	1000	—48		
Chinese Empire,	360		Pekin,	2000	1	2500	1500	150	700	—19		
China Proper,	150		Pekin,	2000	1	1600	10	10	1600	—99		
Japan,	25		Jeddo,	1300	1	1000	700	150	800	—28	0	0
Hindustan,	134		Calcutta,	700	1	1700	1300	80	1200	—25	0	0
Birman Empire,	3	500	Ava,	175	1	1500	400	150	350	—34		
Afghanistan,	6	500	Caboul,	80	3	600	400	200	350	—17		
Bouloochistan,	2		Kelat,	20		500	300	80	200	—20		
Independent Tartary,	5		Boukara,	60	1	1000	600	200	750	—30		
Persia,	12		Teheran,	140	2	1300	600	100	300	—24		
Arabia,	12		Mecca,	40	2	1250	850	70	650	—23	70	70

ES IN THE WORLD, SHEWING THE ORDER OF THEIR CENTRALITY, &c.

miles	Distance of Capital from nearest point.		Rate of deficiency in centrality—from 1 to 100 degs.	Distance of Capital from Ship and Steam Navigation		Other Chief Cities and Towns.	Population. Thousands.	Most Central City or Town.	Cities in the order of their Centrality.	Order of deficiency of centrality.	STATES.
	miles	miles		Ship.	Steam.						
280	50	500	—43	0	0	Dublin.	220	Liverpool,	Three Rivers,	3	Canada,
60	50	200	—54	0	0	Manchester,	200	Birmingham,	Indianapolis,	4	Indiana, U. S.,
110	0	130	—41	0	0	Glasgow,	210	Perth,	Dover,	5	Delaware, U. S.,
150	0	150	—29	0	0	Cork,	120	Athlone,	San Jago,	5	Chili,
150	100	250	—37	100	0	Lyons,	165	Bourges,	Montreal,	5	Canada,
300	160	200	—9			Barcelona,	120	Madrid,	Rome,	8	Italy,
150	20	120	—24	0	0	Oporto,	80	Coimbra,	Toronto,	8	Upper Canada,
400	15	100	8	15	0	Naples,	360	Rome,	Madrid,	9	Spain,
150	0	90	—32	0	0	Palermo,	170	Naples,	Graz,	10	Styria,
60	15	30	—33	15		Bologna,	64	Quebec,	Quebec,	10	Canada,
20	20	220	—42	80		Venice,	120	Verona,	Florence,	11	Tuscany,
80	30	50	—11	30		Leghorn,	50	Florence,	Little Rock,	11	Arkansas,
120	30	70	—13			Geneva,	25	Lucerne,	Stettin,	12	Pomerania,
100	20	110	—30						Hanover,	12	Hanover,
100	40	90	—20						Dresden,	12	Saxony,
200	100	500	—50			Hamburgh,	120		Nashville,	12	Tennessee, U. S.,
70	55	65	—16						Berne,	13	Switzerland,
70	30	90	—29			Olmütz,	15	Brunn,	Brussels,	15	Belgium,
30	20	40	—41			Lintz,	20		Prague,	16	Bohemia,
60	15	60	—28			Trente,		Brixen,	Stuttgart,	16	Württemberg,
80	25	40	—10			Judenburg,			Hartford,	16	Connecticut, U.S.
25	0	60	—54	0	0	Laybach,		Laybach,	Quebec,	17	Lower Canada,
100	20	30	—12	0	0	Stralsund,		Stargard,	Halifax,	17	Nova Scotia,
80	40	100	—32			Nurembourg,	40	Ratisbon,	Trenton,	17	New Jersey, U. S.
80	15	25	—12			Bremen,	40		Tuscaloosa,	17	Alabama, U. S.
70	20	50	—16					Kirkheim,	Chuquisaca,	17	Bolivia,
60	25	30	—12			Leipsick,	41	Dresden,	Caboul,	17	Afghanistan,
80	5	20	—30			Manheim,	22	Baden,	Athens,	18	Greece (mod)
80	30	50	—15			Antwerp,	70	Louvain,	New Guatimala,	18	Guatimala,
100	20	90	—19	0	0	Rotterdam,	75	Doventer,	Charlotte Town,	18	Prince Ed. Island,
200	0	190	—26	0	0	Altona,	26	Colding,	Amsterdam,	19	Holland,
300	0	450	—44	0	0	Gottenburg,	24		Berlin,	19	Prussia, (New.)
130	130	500	—29	0	0	Milan,	140	Buda,	Vandalia,	19	Illinois, U. S.
150	100	250	—34			Post,	61	Buda,	Pekin,	19	Chinese Emp.
250	150	500	—41			Dantzick,	61	Pinska,	Columbus,	19	Ohio, U. S.
130	50	300	—50	0	0	Breslaw,	90	Posen,	Constantinople,	20	Turkish Emp.
400	50	300	—19						Lucerne,	20	Switzerland,
130	40	120	—18	5	5				Milledgeville,	20	Georgia, U. S.
0	0	700	—100	0	0	Adrianople,	120	Sophia,	Tallahassee,	20	Florida, U. S.
000	240	900	—20	0	0	Moscow,	250	Moscow,	Kelat,	20	Bouloochistan,
									Kingston,	20	Canada,
									St. Petersburg,	20	Russia (Eur.)
									Annapolis,	21	Maryland, U. S.
									Montpelier,	21	Vermont, do.
									Columbia,	21	S. Carolina do.
700	20	200	—20	0	0	Adrianople,	120	Konieh,	Frankfort,	22	Kentucky, do.
700	240	1500	—49	0	0	Moscow,	250	Tobolsk,	Goudar,	22	Abyssinia,
									Raleigh,	22	N. Carolina, U. S.
									Mecca,	23	Arabia,
									Lisbon,	23	Portugal,
									Teheran,	24	Persia,
0	0	1300	—100	0	0	Damascus,	200	Diarbekir,	Calcutta,	25	Hindustan,
500	200	1000	—48			Irkoutsk,	30	Kirensk,	Copenhagen,	26	Denmark,
10	10	1600	—99			Singuanfou,	1000	Lanteheou,	Augusta,	26	Maine, U. S.
700	150	800	—28	0	0	Singuanfou,	1000	Kingtchoufou,	Jefferson City,	26	Missouri, U. S.
300	80	1200	—25	0	0	Benares,	700	Jeddo,	Lima,	26	Peru,
400	150	350	—34			Pegu,	600	Allahabad,	Inspruck,	28	Tyrol,
400	200	350	—17			Candahar,	150	Pegu,	Jeddo,	28	Japan,
300	80	200	—20				100		Dublin,	29	Ireland,
600	200	750	—30			Samarcand,	60		Vienna,	29	Austrian Emp.
600	100	300	—24			Ispahan,	200		Brunn,	29	Moravia & Silesia,
850	70	650	—23	70	70	Muscat,	60		Tripoli,	29	Tripoli,
									Zurich,	30	Switzerland.
									Karlsruhe,	30	Baden.

KINGDOMS AND STATES.	Population of Kingdoms and States.		CAPITALS.	Population of Capitals. Thousands.	Rate of Capital as to other Cities same State.	Distance of Capital from the farthest point.	Distance of Capital from the farthest extremity in the opposite direction to the nearest point.	Distance of Capital from nearest point.	Distance of Capital from opposite extremity to nearest point.	Rate of deficiency in cen- trality—from 1 to 100 deg.	Distance of Capital from Ship and Steam Navigation.		Other Chief Towns
	Thousands.	Millions.									Ship.	Steam.	
AFRICA.													
Egypt,	4	500	Grand Cairo,	300	1	500	120	35	200	-44			Alexandr
Abyssinia,	2	700	Gondar,	50	1	400	200	190	250	-22			
Algiers,	2	700	Algiers,	120	1	400	200	0	250	-37	0	0	Constanti
Tunis,	2		Tunis,	130	1	320	60	50	100	-41	0	0	
Tripoli,	2		Tripoli,	25	1	530	240	0	150	-29	0	0	
—o—													
AMERICA.													
New Brunswick,		120	Frederickton,	3	2	180	70	50	100	-32	30	0	St. John,
Nova Scotia,		125	Halifax,	20	1	230	150	0	50	-17	0	0	Pictou,
Newfoundland,		75	St. John,	15	1	400	60	0	350	-75	0	0	
Prince Edward Island,		25	Charlotte Town,	2	1	80	60	10	40	-18	0	0	Princetow
Lower-Canada,		600	Quebec,	30	2	500	230	50		-17	0	0	Montreal,
Upper-Canada,		400	Toronto,	5	2	300	220	30		8	500	0	Kingston,
Canada,			Toronto,	5		1030	220	30		-32	500	0	Montreal,
do.			Kingston,	7	3	880	370	10		-20	380	0	
do.			Montreal,	40	1	680	570	35		5	180	0	
do.			Three Rivers,			660	590	100		3	90	0	
do.			Quebec,	30	12	750	500	50		-10	0	0	
United States,	15		Washington,	20	0	1800	600	100	500	-33			New York
Maine,		400	Augusta,	4	2	200	100	35	90	-26	30	0	Portland,
New Hampshire,		270	Concord,	4	3	160	35	35	45	-35		45	Portsmouth
Vermont,		280	Montpelier,	2	7	115	55	25	35	-21	35	35	Burlington
Massachusetts,		610	Boston,	65	1	130	80	0	130	-43	0	0	Salem,
Connecticut,		300	Hartford,	10	2	75	50	20	35	-16	0	0	Middletow
do.			New Haven,	11	1	75	45	0	50	-33			
Rhode Island,		100	Providence,	17	1	50	12	3	20	-44	0	0	Warwick,
do.			Newport,	8	2	40	1	0	40	-99	0	0	
New-York,	2		Albany,	25	2	310	20	20	310	-88	150	0	New York
New Jersey,		320	Trenton,	4	4	100	80	0	40	-17	30		Newark,
Pennsylvania,	1	400	Harrisburg,	5	5	210	90	42	100	-30			Philadelph
Delaware,		75	Dover,	2	3	60	50	8	10	-5	10	10	Wilmington
Ohio,	1		Columbus,	4	3	200	110	90	120	-19			Cincinnati
Indiana,		350	Indianapolis,	1	5	170	150	70	75	-4			85 New Albat
Illinois,		160	Vandalia,			200	100	45	60	-19			45 Chicago,
Missouri,		140	Jefferson City,			210	140	90	200	-26	0	0	St. Lewis,
Maryland,		450	Annapolis,	3	4	180	100	20	60	-21	0	0	Baltimore,
Virginia,		210	Richmond,	16	1	300	80	80	300	-58	34	0	Norfolk,
Kentucky,		700	Frankfort,	2	4	280	150	40	100	-22	0	0	Louisville,
North Carolina,		750	Raleigh,	2	4	320	180	60	140	-22	120		Newbern,
South Carolina,		600	Columbia,	3	2	150	115	65	140	-21	140		Charleston
Georgia,		520	Milledgeville,	14	4	200	180	70	200	-20	100	0	Savannah,
Tennessee,		700	Nashville,	6	1	280	200	35	70	-12		0	Knoxville,
Alabama,		310	Tuscaloosa,	2	2	300	250	60	200	-17	300	0	Mobile,
Mississippi,		140	Jackson,	2	2	420	220	75	260	-30		75	Natchez,
Louisiana,		220	New Orleans,	50	1	330	90	40	50	-30	0	0	Donaldson
Michigan,		32	Detroit,	9	1	260	50	0	170	-61	0	0	Monroe,
Florida,		35	Tallahassee,	1	3	420	190	20	30	-20	30	30	Pensacola,
Arkansas,		58	Little Rock,			350	320	180	300	-11		0	Arkansas,
Texas,		80	Houston,			900	300	50	900	-60	25	25	Bexar,
Mexico,	8		Mexico,	150	1	1500	400	160	200	-30	160		Guadalajar
Guatemala or Central Republic,	2		New Guatemala,	40	1	240	150	50	100	-18	40	40	Coban,
Columbia,	3		Bagota,	50	2	1200	700	200	1200	-40			Quito,
Brazil,	5		Rio Janeiro,	200	1	230	0	0	230	-100	0	0	San Salva
Peru,	1	700	Lima,	80	1	850	800	0	800	-26		6	Arequipa,
Bolivia,	1	300	Chuquisaca,	30	2	600	550	200	550	-17	230		Potosi,
United Provinces (Argentine Republic,)		800	Buenos Ayres,	80	1	1200	500	100	600	-35	9		Cordova,
Paraguay,		400	Assomption,	10	1	75	25	0	40	-45	30	0	Conception,
Banda Oriental (Uruguay,)		110	Monte Video,	16	1	600	0	0	600	-100		0	
Chili.	1	400	San Jago,	40	1	900	750	75	75	-4	75	75	Valparaiso,

Distance of Capital from opposite extremity to nearest point.	Rate of deficiency in centrality—from 1 to 100 degs.	Distance of Capital from Ship and Steam Navigation.		Other Chief Cities and Towns.	Population. Thousands.	Most central City or Town.	Cities in the order of their Centrality.	STATES.
		Ship.	Steam.					
200	-44			Alexandria,	25	Tiout,	Harrisburg,	30 Pennsylvania, U. S.
250	-22						Jackson,	30 Mississippi,
250	-37	0	0	Constantine.	60		Mexico,	30 Mexico,
100	-41	0	0				Boukara,	30 Indpdt. Tartary,
150	-29	0	0				New Orleans,	30 Louisiana,
							Naples,	30 Naples,
							Munich,	32 Bavaria,
							Frederickton,	32 New Brunswick,
							Toronto,	32 Canada,
100	-32	30	0	St. John,	10	Frederickton,	Rome,	33 Papal Dominions,
50	-17	0	0	Pictou,	3	Windsor,	Washington,	33 United States,
350	-75	0	0				Newhaven,	33 Connecticut, U. S.
40	-18	0	0	Princetown,			Buda,	34 Hungary,
	-17	0	0	Montreal,	40	Quebec,	Ava,	34 Birman Emp.
	8	500	0	Kingston,	7		Concord,	35 N. Hampshire, U. S.
	-32	500	0	Montreal,	40	Three Rivers,	Buenos Ayres,	35 United Provinces, (Argentine Rep.)
	-20	380	0				Paris,	37 France,
	-5	180	0				Algiers,	37 Algiers,
	3	90	0				Bagotu,	40 Columbia,
	-10	0	0				Edinburgh,	41 Scotland,
500	-33	0	0	New York,	250	Lexington,	Warsaw,	41 Poland (Old)
90	-26	30	0	Portland,	13	Brownville,	Vienna,	41 Austria Proper,
45	-35		45	Portsmouth,	8	Plymouth,	Tunis,	41 Tunis,
35	-21		35	Burlington,	4	Bethel,	Milan,	42 Lombardy,
							London,	43 Gt. Brit. & Irel.
130	-43	0	0	Salem,	14	Worcester,	Boston,	43 Massachusetts,
35	-16	0	0	Middletown,	7	Middletown,	Stockholm,	44 Sweden & Norway
50	-33					do.	Providence,	44 Rhode Island,
20	-44	0	0	Warwick,	6	Greenwich,	Grand Cairo,	44 Egypt,
40	-99	0	0			do.	Assomption,	45 Paraguay,
310	-88	150	0	New York,	250	Utica,	Tobolsk,	48 Siberia,
40	-17	30		Newark,	11	Trenton,	St. Petersburg,	49 Russian Emp.
100	-30			Philadelphia,	200	Bellefont,	Berlin,	50 Prussia (Old).
10	-5	10	10	Wilmington,	7	Dover,	Frankfort,	50 Germ. Confedtn.
120	-19		80	Cincinnati,	30	Mount Vernon,	London,	54 England,
75	-4		85	New Albany,	3	Indianapolis,	Trieste,	54 Illyria,
60	-19		45	Chicago,	5	Springfield,	Richmond,	58 Virginia, U. S.
200	-26		0	St. Lewis,	20	Jefferson City,	Houston,	60 Texas,
60	-21	0	0	Baltimore,	-80	Annapolis,	Detroit,	61 Michigan, U. S.
300	-58	34	0	Norfolk,	10	Lexington,	St. Johns,	75 Newfoundland,
100	-22		0	Louisville,	10	Springfield,	Albany,	88 New York, U. S.
140	-22	120		Newbern,	4	Raleigh,	New Port,	99 Rhode Island, U. S.
140	-21	140		Charleston,	30	Columbia,	Pekin,	99 China Proper,
200	-20	100	0	Savannah,	3	Milledgeville,	Constantinople,	100 Turkey (Eur.)
70	-12		0	Knoxville,	3	Murfreesborough,	do.	100 Turkey, (Asia.)
200	-17	300	0	Mobile,	3	Centreville,	Rio Janeiro,	100 Brazil,
260	-30		75	Natchez,	3	Jackson,	Monte Video.	100 Banda Oriental, (Uruguay.)
50	-30	0	0	Donaldsonville,		Oplonsas,		
170	-61	0	0	Monroe,	3	Ada,		
30	-20	30	30	Pensacola,	3	Alachos,		
300	-11		0	Arkansas,		Little Rock,		
900	-60		25	Bexar,	4	Austin,		
200	-30	160		Guadalaxara,	80	Durango,		
100	-18	40	40	Coban,	14	Comaygua,		
1200	-40			Quito,	70			
230	-100	0	0	San Salvador,	120	Cunha,		
800	-26		6	Arequipa,	42	Tampianasqui,		
550	-17	230		Potosi,	30	Chuquisaca,		
600	-35	9		Cordova,	14	Cordova,		
40	-45	30	0	Concepcion,	4	Penon,		
600	-100		0			St. Maria,		
75	-3	75		Valparaiso,	25	San Jago.		

Distance of Capital from Ship and Steam Navigation.	Ship.	Steam.	Other Chief Cities and Towns.	Population. Thousands.	Most central City or Town.	Cities in the order of their Centrality.	Order of deficiency of Centrality.	STATES.
44			Alexandria,	25	Tiout,	Harrisburg,	30	Pennsylvania, U.S.
29						Jackson,	30	Mississippi,
32	0	0	Constantine.	60		Mexico,	30	Mexico,
41	0	0				Bonkara,	30	Indpdt. Tartary,
29	0	0				New Orleans,	30	Louisiana,
						Naples,	30	Naples,
						Munich,	30	Bavaria,
						Frederickton,	32	New Brunswick,
						Toronto,	32	Canada,
						Rome,	33	Papal Dominions,
32	30	0	St. John,	10	Frederickton,	Washington,	33	United States,
17	0	0	Pictou,	3	Windsor,	Newhaven,	33	Connecticut, U. S.
75	0	0				Buda,	34	Hungary,
18	0	0	Princetown,			Ava,	34	Birman Emp.
17	0	0	Montreal,	40	Quebec,	Concord,	35	N. Hemisphere, U.S.
8	500	0	Kingston,	7		Buenos Ayres,	35	United Provinces,
32	500	0	Montreal,	40	Three Rivers,			(Argentine Rep.)
20	380	0				Paris,	37	France,
5	180	0				Algiers,	37	Algiers,
3	90	0				Bagota,	40	Columbia,
10	0	0				Edinburgh,	41	Scotland,
33	0	0	New York,	250	Lexington,	Warsaw,	41	Poland (Old)
26	30	0	Portland,	13	Brownville,	Vienna,	41	Austria Proper,
35	45	0	Portsmouth,	8	Plymouth,	Tunis,	41	Tunis,
21	35	0	Burlington,	4	Bethel,	Milan,	42	Lombardy,
						London,	43	Gt. Brit. & Irel.
13	0	0	Salem,	14	Worcester,	Boston,	43	Massachusetts,
6	0	0	Middletown,	7	Middletown,	Stockholm,	44	Sweden & Norway
13					do.	Providence,	44	Rhode Island,
14	0	0	Warwick,	6	Greenwich,	Grand Cairo,	44	Egypt,
29	0	0			do.	Assumption,	45	Paraguay,
28	150	0	New York,	250	Utica,	Tobolsk,	48	Siberia,
7	30	0	Newark,	11	Trenton,	St. Petersburg,	49	Russian Emp.
5			Philadelphia,	200	Bellefont,	Berlin,	50	Prussia (Old).
9	10	10	Wilmington,	7	Dover,	Frankfort,	50	Germ. Confedtn.
9	80	0	Cincinnati,	30	Mount Vernon,	London,	54	England,
4	85	0	New Albany,	3	Indianapolis,	Trieste,	54	Illyria,
9	45	0	Chicago,	5	Springfield,	Richmond,	58	Virginia, U. S.
6	0	0	St. Lewis,	28	Jefferson City,	Houston,	60	Texas,
1	0	0	Baltimore,	80	Annapolis,	Detroit,	61	Michigan, U. S.
8	34	0	Norfolk,	10	Lexington,	St. Johns,	75	Newfoundland,
2			Louisville,	10	Springfield,	Albany,	88	New York, U. S.
2	120	0	Newb -n,	4	Raleigh,	New Port,	99	Rhode Island, U.S.
1	140	0	Charleston,	30	Columbia,	Pekin,	99	China Proper,
0	100	0	Savannah,	3	Milledgeville,	Constantinople,	100	Turkey (Eur.)
2			Knoxville,	3	Murfreesborough,	do.	100	Turkey, (Asia,)
7	300	0	Mobile,	3	Centreville,	Rio Janeiro,	100	Brazil,
0			Natchez,	3	Jackson,	Monte Video.	100	Banda Oriental,
0	0	75	Donalsonville,	3	Oplonsas,			(Uruguay.)
1	0	0	Monroe,	3	Ada,			
0	30	30	Pensacola,	3	Alachos,			
1			Arkansas,		Little Rock,			
0			Bexar,	4	Austin,			
0	160	0	Guadalaxara,	80	Durango,			
3	40	40	Coban,	14	Comaygua,			
			Quito,	70				
	0	0	San Salvador,	120	Cunha,			
	6	0	Arequipa,	42	Tampianasqui,			
		230	Potosi,	30	Chquisaca,			
	9		Cordova,	14	Cordova,			
	30	0	Conception,	4	Penon,			
		0		2	St. Maria,			
		75	Valparaiso,	25	San Jago.			

AUGUST 1856.

The foregoing observations were written twelve years ago.—Their chief aim was to demonstrate that the small superiority of Montreal over Quebec in mere territorial centrality, was no equivalent for the other great advantages possessed by the latter for a seat of Government. Since then "a change has come over the spirit of our dream." Railways and electric telegraphs have annihilated distance, and centrality has ceased to be a question,—thus adding materially to the preference already due to Quebec on a fair consideration of all the requisites for a proper site for the Government of this Province. Nor has the superiority claimed for Quebec been in the least impaired by any new or adventitious circumstances supervened since 1843; on the contrary its value has been enhanced by the course of events.

No sane man will deny that security from foreign aggression is a paramount question in time of war; and no impartial reasoner upon the subject will controvert the proposition, that however profound may be the peace which we now enjoy, and however durable it may promise to be, the precautions necessitated by a state of war must be looked forward to, and provided for in time of peace. This has passed into a maxim as the settled policy of all the nations of the globe. Then how stands the question of peace or war at the present moment? Has the probability of war diminished since the Union? Have our ambitious neighbours become less aggressive or grasping? Have they manifested a more amicable disposition towards Great Britain? Let their conduct in respect to the recent European contest answer for them.—England and France, as the leading Powers of Europe, have been engaged in a gigantic and costly war, not in defence of their own individual rights, but of the civilization and the liberties of Europe, against the aggressions of Russia, and in reality against the despotism of the northern hordes, who now as of yore, are ready to overrun the more polished nations of the south. With whom have the people of the land of liberty *par excellence*—the disciples of Washington—sympathised? Whose cause has been espoused by the movement party of the Union,—they who ride rough-shod over the intelligence and respectability of their country, and effectually govern its destinies for good or evil?—They have openly and unblushingly sided with the advocates of despotism and barbarism, and only seek a pretext to array themselves against the chivalry of France and England, and the heartfelt sympathies of the various nations and peoples of Europe who still pant for liberty;—thus destroying root and branch—the *prestige* of their much vaunted revolution, imprinting an indelible stain upon their republicanism and seriously damaging the cause of civil liberty throughout the world. On every occasion on which England happens to be threatened with a war, or actually engaged in one, whether in defence of her rights, in vindication of the national honor, or as the champion of the liberties of the weaker nations of the great European Family, American statesmen, well knowing the bent of their people, will furnish their diplomatic tools with some subterfuge likely to produce a rupture, of which the one now under discussion is perhaps the most flimsy and the most disingenuous;—and American ingenuity will not fail to discover some pretext for a quarrel, by which the proud position of England may be lowered, and they themselves possibly raised a little higher in the scale of nations. Their inordinate national vanity, and their jealousy if not hatred of England would be gratified to the full, and no sacrifice either moral or material would be too great, could they succeed in making their advancement coeval with the downfall of England, the country from whose people and institutions they imbibed the first principles of that liberty in the excessive indulgence of which they are now running riot, utterly regardless of the eternal laws of justice and honor.

If such be the conclusion to which our experience of the policy past and present of the United States necessarily leads us, there can be no question that we are bound to select that place for a permanent seat of government, which, if it be perfectly compatible with the reasonable and probable exigencies of peace, will afford the greatest security in time of war for the protection of the persons of the Governor, the members of the Executive and Legislative Bodies and the officers of the Government, as well as the preservation of the public archives of the Province. In the event of a war, the seat of government, wherever it may be, will assuredly be the first and main object of attack. Would it be wise now to incur an expenditure of a million of dollars for the erection of public buildings suitable to the rank and importance of this Province, and in accordance with the wishes of the people, in Montreal, or in any other place west of Quebec, only to be laid in ashes on the first outbreak? The position of Montreal,—now as before the most ambitious rival of Quebec, instead of being strengthened, is on the contrary very seriously impaired by its material improvements. The numerous railroads uniting there would greatly facilitate the advance and concentration of a hostile force, and in so brief a space of time as to take the city by surprise: and that stupendous undertaking,—the Victoria bridge,—so creditable to the Province, will, when completed, assuredly render Montreal more defenceless than before. On the approach of an invading army, whether composed of regulars, militiamen or marauders, one of two things must inevitably occur; either the railroads and the great Bridge must be destroyed, or the Government must again repeat its disastrous flight from that city.

The pretensions of Ottawa (Bytown) are much extolled by reason of its inland and central position, and its capabilities for a fortified city. Centrality has vanished; and what would the best fortifications avail without troops to man them. In the event of a war the enemy would measure the strength and position of every piece on the chessboard, and in all probability the first strategical manoeuvre would cut off all communication between Quebec and the fortified inland city, by which the Governor and his Executive, and the Members of the Legislature, if in session, would become the first prisoners of war. An incalculable loss of blood and treasure would then be incurred in order to regain the position which the exercise of a little wisdom and foresight would have secured before hand. In such a lamentable plight the Queen's Vice-gerent might indite despatches to the Home Government without number, but would they ever reach Quebec or any other place from which their transmission to England might be effected? The Legislators of the day who strenuously contend respectively for Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston and Toronto, without venturing to advance one solid argument to sustain their views, will answer—"that we are not now at war nor likely soon to be, and that it will be time enough to guard against its evils when we are menaced with invasion,"—resorting moreover to a host of similar arguments and reasons entirely beside the question, and which become unanswerable solely by reason of their puerility. The only possible relief they could suggest in such an unfortunate,—though by no means improbable predicament, would be—that the Queen's Representative might escape the indignity of his position by taking flight in a balloon and running the risk of reaching Quebec, or peradventure making a descent into Lake Champlain, or alighting on the Green Mountains of Vermont. His governmental staff might adopt the alternative of following his fortunes by the same aerial medium, or "resign"!

Let us contrast Ottawa or any other city, town or village of Canada with the fortress of Quebec under such untoward circumstances. Should the enemy first direct his attention towards Quebec, it requires very little knowledge of military tactics to divine what his plan of campaign must be. The invading army must be composed of a regular—well disciplined body of troops, accompanied with Artillery, Engineers and a well supplied Commissariat. Every necessary preparation must be made and precaution taken for investing the town and maintaining a protracted siege. The organization and equipment of such a force could not be

accomplished in secrecy. Its march through their own territory and over one hundred miles of ours, would afford the authorities and people of Canada a little time to marshal their forces and make preparations for attack or defence, and thus guard against surprise; and ere the beleaguered fortress could be at all subjected to any of the ordinary privations of a siege, the British pennants would be floating from the "wooden walls of old England" in the harbour of Quebec.

Widely different would be the aspect of affairs should the enemy first march upon Montreal or the embryo Metropolis of the Ottawa, or even upon Kingston or Toronto. The character and equipment of the invading force would be a matter of little moment. All that would seem to be necessary would be a simultaneous rising, secretly organised, of the filibustering population of the States bordering on Canada to the extent of some fifteen or twenty thousand, without Artillery, Engineers or Commissariat, each man shouldering his musket or his rifle, with five days provisions on his back. Such an undisciplined—unofficered horde might march to the Province in forty eight hours, and by a *coup de main* take possession of any one of the other localities which now aspire to have the seat of government located among them, for the express purpose, one would suppose, of attracting the enemy to a weak and vulnerable point.

Within the walls of Quebec the Governor General would be able calmly to review the condition of affairs and to commit the result to paper, without apprehension of being ingloriously incarcerated within the limits of his government, (a most untoward mishap, which would of itself tarnish the honor of his country;) and with the certainty that his messenger, in a few minutes thereafter, would step on board an armed British Steamer, and wend his way at once to the Metropolis of England, without danger from any of those casualties by which a land communication would be beset, and in full confidence that as long as England remains "Mistress of the Seas," the destinies of Canada would not be abandoned to a horde of filibusters without relief from the other side of the Atlantic. The mighty armament which anon awaited but the order to demolish the adamantine defences of St. Petersburg, could rapidly transport the gallant army of the Crimea to the citadel of Quebec to win fresh laurels in expelling the invaders from our midst. Quebec is confessedly the key to the Canadas; they constitute the stronghold of British possession in North America; and on the day on which, either by the apathy or the stolidity of our statesmen, this important appendage of the Crown is lost to Great Britain, away go the other North American Provinces and eventually all her empire on this continent. The salutary admonitions of history sufficiently warn us of the certain consequences of such a calamity.

In addition to the reasons already assigned for the eligibility of Quebec as the seat of the Canadian Government, there are other considerations involved in the choice which are assuredly not undeserving of notice.

The union of Upper and Lower Canada was decreed for the purpose, as it is generally believed, of setting off the reputed loyalty of the English Inhabitants of the former against the disaffection of the Lower Canadian French, and of putting a "strait-jacket" upon Lower Canada. The population of the nether Province was then greatly superior to that of the Upper. The marriage contract, however, was drawn upon just and fair principles, and the two Provinces became one on an equal footing in respect of representation. In 1849 some Lower Canadians in Parliament made a move for representation on the basis of population, which was very properly, and—it must be admitted, very magnanimously negatived by an overwhelming majority of the delegates of their section,—all those of Upper Canada deliberately, but very improvidently as it turns out—voting with them,—thus refusing to acknowledge this pretension, and solemnly ratifying the governing principle of the Act of Union. This principle has since been disturbed, and despotically, though possibly unwittingly infringed by the Imperial Parliament in their repeal of the Proviso of the Act of Union, requiring a vote of two thirds of the Legislative Assembly and Legislative Council as a condition precedent to the sanctioning of any Bill altering the number of Representatives,—a trick in all probability

secretly hatched by some deep—plotting knave of the Province in the interest of a party, palmed upon the Metropolitan Government and smuggled through Parliament without the knowledge or consent of the people or Government of this Country—, a high-handed and daring act calculated to endanger the allegiance of a whole people who, though by no means an independent—consenting party to the contract, had every reason to rely upon the justice and the honor of the Parent Legislature to be treated as such in any subsequent legislation on this vital question. Upper Canada obtained considerable advantages by the Union. It was beneficial to it in a financial point of view. It conferred upon it a new political existence by the subsequent and consequent introduction of Responsible Government,—a concession which never could have been extorted from England in favor of either Province, while Lower Canada was supposed to be in a condition not to be entrusted with self-government.—Fifteen years have since elapsed; and no sooner have the two sections approached an equality in numbers, than certain agitators in Upper Canada begin to resuscitate the cry of Representation by population, under the expectation that in a few years their section will far outnumber the other; and this agitation seems not to be unacceptable to a certain portion of their people, and to be participated in, moreover, by some prominent politicians of the old Family Compact party, whom the “greatest good of the greatest number” had never before induced to condescend to “agitate” on any matter or thing calculated to arouse public opinion, adversely to the existing order of things, however unpopular or reprehensible it might be. Of course this new band of patriots, although composed, it is true, of somewhat heterogeneous materials, choose to forget the solemn refusal of Upper Canada by the unanimous voice of her representatives in Parliament, to concede the same principle to Lower Canada when it possessed, that which Upper Canada has *not yet* acquired, a large majority over the other section. They complacently “disremember” that *they* were the only consenting party to the *bans*; that a union of two countries differing *toto caelo* in language, laws, religion, customs, manners and traditions, was imposed by the supreme legislative authority upon *Lower* Canada, and that the principle of a perfect equality became a necessary ingredient of the contract, with the wise and just intention of guarding against any undue advantage being taken by the one over the other. This principle of the Union must now be reversed, and the same reasons which presided at its consummation trodden under foot in the interest of *one* section of the Province, which now happens to be, or is expected hereafter to become, diametrically opposed to what that section contended for but a few years ago, when it suited their purpose. Such a fratricidal course must necessarily tend to the dismemberment of either section. A time may come when the preponderance of Upper Canada in population will be so great that it can no longer be overlooked without endangering the peace of the Province. What then will be the condition of that country whose financial and political rights were rudely assailed to meet the exigencies of the day!—

Again the social and political condition of the neighbouring Republic by no means prognosticates its permanency. Elements of discord continue to simmer in the national cauldron. The curse of slavery on the one hand, and the still greater curse of ungodly fanaticism and intolerance on the other, suggest the possibility of a disruption at no very distant period. The invasion and subjugation of Canada by the United States, or a severance of the Northern from the Southern States of that country, might lead to very different results as regards our relations with them or the adjacent Provinces. Whatever may be the issue, the inhabitants of Canada and the other Provinces contemplate with horror the bare possibility of witnessing the degrading spectacle of the execution of the fugitive slave law in their midst; and this plague spot in the vista will long keep their hearts right towards the standard of Victoria, in whose dominions a man's freedom is not measured by his color. In order the more securely to prevent our being absorbed by the Great Republic under any contingency, these Provinces may come to the conclusion that the high and honorable degree of freedom which they now enjoy may be best guaranteed and

transmitted unimpaired to their descendants by a federal or legislative union of the whole. The obstacles interposed by distance are, from day to day, being fast surmounted by lines of railroads uniting and intersecting them all, and commercial reciprocity and a community of interests on many points are gradually, but not the less surely, bringing men's minds to look forward to this union as a matter of necessity. Reverting again to the prospective numerical superiority of the population of Upper over Lower Canada and its threatened consequences, we would seem to glide naturally and imperceptibly towards a general union, as the only sedative to the elements of commotion, external and internal, which now overshadow the future of this Province. Assuming that the union of all the North American Provinces is an event not at all improbable, but one to which various progressive changes in our political existence seem to point as a haven of refuge from the storms which may follow upon the small specks now visible in the horizon, then are we bound in common prudence to reflect ere we put the final seal upon the choice of a seat of Government. It is obviously the duty of our public men to take these possible contingencies into their serious consideration, and to select some place which, while it meets the wants of the now Province of Canada, will also be adapted for the seat of Government of all the British Provinces. The mere contemplation of such an important change in our condition at once suggests the city of Quebec as not only the fittest, but the *only* fit place for that purpose. Besides—and this is by no means the least important feature of the case,—the heavy expence to be incurred in the erection of suitable edifices would then be borne, not by the Province of Canada alone,—but by all the Provinces; and these buildings, if commenced now, could be laid out in such a manner as to render them susceptible of being enlarged on a scale commensurate with the wants of the United Provinces without infringing or destroying the original plan.

The propriety, therefore, of selecting Quebec as the Seat of Government either of Canada or of the United Provinces, is eminently enhanced by a contemplation of all these possible contingencies; and the "finger on the wall" points menacingly to the folly of establishing it in any other place.

Such are a few of the considerations which present themselves to the most unreflecting mind at the present juncture and which are amply sufficient to convict our metropolitan and Colonial Statesmen of 1843 of the fatal error of deferring to the judgment of a popular body, who obviously could never be expected to tender to the Crown a strictly disinterested and patriotic advice, sustained by a large or decisive majority, upon a question so fatally embarrassing to their popularity individually as delegates of particular localities. The writer has committed them to the public in the hopes that those who uphold the superiority of Toronto, Kingston, Montreal and Ottawa will not disdain to enter the arena and advocate the eligibility of their respective localities by arguments and reasons addressed to the common sense of mankind, and the best calculated to lead to a wise determination of this long mooted point.

Since the foregoing was written, the question of the Seat of Government has passed through the Legislative Assembly, terminating on the 16th April last in favor of the City of Quebec by successive majorities of *twenty four* over Hamilton, *twenty one* over Toronto, *fourteen* over Kingston, *ten* over Montreal, and *thirty four* over Ottawa, thus establishing the order of eligibility in the opinion of the Assembly as follows:—Quebec, Montreal, Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton and Ottawa. On the same day and before the votes were taken, the Governor General, by a message to the Assembly delivered by the Attorney General for Lower Canada, informed the House that His Excellency was ready to discontinue the present system of convening Parliament alternately at Toronto and Quebec when the necessary information as to what was most convenient to the Legislature, and the requisite means for carrying out its wishes, should be in the possession of His Excellency. On the 18th April, Mr. Macdonald, member for Glengary, having previously given the required notice, moved an Address to the Governor General praying that in consequence of the vote of the House, His Excellency would be pleased to recommend an appropria-

tion to be made for the construction of suitable buildings for the accommodation of the Legislature and Government in the City of Quebec. The Attorney General for Upper Canada, in his seat, declared that the Government would be prepared to ask during the present Session for an appropriation in accordance with the decision of the House, upon which announcement the Address was withdrawn as being unnecessary.

This all important question, carried through the popular Branch by successive majorities, was deemed to have been finally put at rest by the passing in that House of the Bill of supply containing an item of £50,000, as an instalment of the amount required for the erection of suitable public buildings at Quebec for the use of the Government and Legislature. The Representatives of the People being thus committed to a vote which they and every right minded inhabitant of Canada, believed in his heart to be a just one, and the Governor General and the Administration of the day having publicly pledged themselves to its faithful and prompt execution, no individual throughout the length and breadth of the land ever dreamed that the intentions of either would be perverted by the other Branch of the Legislature. Nevertheless the people of this Province were suddenly awakened by the astounding intelligence that the *Legislative Council*!—that Body whose historical annals are but a tissue of acts of subserviency to the Powers of the day, had concluded to thwart the wishes of the people and of the Crown, and to give effect to the sinister views of particular localities, by nothing less than a resolution to stop the supplies!—a movement of so marked a revolutionary character that the Commons of England and of the Canadas have never resorted to it except in times of impending convulsion. This bold determination they took on the strength of a majority of *three*! in a House reduced by absentees to twenty one members, and on the hollow pretext that *they* had not been consulted. The members of that body who were absent from their Legislative duties, more particularly those from the Lower Section of the Province, who have thus by their apathy and want of patriotism or other more unworthy motive or cause, produced this untoward result, wantonly and heartlessly damnifying the material interests of the City and District of Quebec, if not of Lower Canada, and permitting a faction in the Council to take a most unusual and unconstitutional course which may be pregnant with future disaster to the whole Province;—these *fainéants*—who though repeatedly urged to repair to their posts, sent their paltry excuses instead, and abandoned Lower Canada to its fate in its hour of need, must stand prepared to render an account of their stewardship at the bar of public opinion. Every individual member of that Chamber knew, and if he did not know, his ignorance would have entitled him to a public flagellation, that the selection of a place for the permanent Seat of Government appertained exclusively to the Prerogative of the Crown, a constitutional principle the wisdom of which has been but too forcibly illustrated by each Branch of the Legislature in this very matter. They well knew that neither Branch could set up a claim of right to be consulted;—that the Legislative Assembly, the sole constitutional exponent of the wishes of the people of this Province, had *not* been consulted, nor had arrogated to themselves the right to be consulted. They tendered their advice to the Crown as it was their indisputable right to do; the Legislative Council might have adopted a similar course, as they in fact did in April of the preceding year, when their wishes and views coincided with those of the Assembly of the present year. But not they preferred at the eleventh hour to take advantage of a thin House and to signalize their transition from a state of independence, to one of pusillanimous dread—of the breath of the people, by pandering to the clamors of political agitators put forth in the interest of certain localities. This conduct on their part is the more reprehensible when we contrast it with their address to the Crown on the same subject in 1855, recorded in the 387th page of their Journals, in which—sage and silly by turns, as it would appear, they enunciate the following sentiments:

"TO HIS EXCELLENCY SIR EDMUND WALKER HEAD, &c."

"We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Council of Canada, in Provincial Parliament assembled, beg leave respectfully to represent to Your Excellency that, in our opinion, the time has arrived when the Royal Prerogative should be exercised in determining upon a permanent seat of Government in this Province; that the system of holding alternate Parliaments at Quebec and Toronto is objectionable and detrimental to the Public Service, on account of its manifest and extreme inconvenience, that it involves a large expenditure of the Public Funds, and that by the frequent transportation from place to place of the several departments connected with the Government—the security and safe keeping of the Libraries, Records and Archives of the Country are seriously endangered.

"We therefore pray that Your Excellency will be pleased in the exercise of the Royal Prerogative to fix permanently upon some convenient place for the annual assembling of Parliament, and we beg to assure Your Excellency of our cheerful concurrence in any proposition you may think fit to make for the appropriation of Public Money for the erection of suitable buildings for the accommodation of the Three Branches of the Legislature, at the place which may be so fixed upon by your Excellency."

Having thus anathematized the alternate system as *detrimental to the Public Service! extremely inconvenient! involving a large expenditure!—and seriously endangering the security of the Libraries and the Archives of the Province!!* they do an act which tends to perpetuate these very evils:—having earnestly prayed his Excellency to exercise the Royal Prerogative for the choice of a permanent place and assured him of their cheerful concurrence in *any* proposition for the appropriation of the necessary funds to that end—thus proffering their advice and their *cheerful concurrence!* without ever having been asked or "*consulted*;"—no sooner does his Excellency in harmony with the Lower House accede to their request, than these specimens of profound wisdom resolve to frustrate the views and determination of the Crown and people by withholding the annual supplies, at the risk of suddenly interrupting all the Public Works of the Province, consigning hundreds of families to destitution, and arresting the whole machinery of Government. They first pathetically bewail a public evil and solicit a remedy; they next "eat their own words," and stultify themselves by repudiating the prayer of their own address and aping the acts of popular assemblies in times of great excitement; and for all this extravagance, they gravely assign a reason condemned by their own previous solemn declarations, and of so shallow and unfounded a character as to be worse than a falsehood, and to be an insult to common sense.

The Legislative Council constitute a third co-ordinate Branch in the Parliament of Canada. Its functions, assimilated to those of its counterpart in the British Constitution, are clearly defined; they are called into serious action when the torrent of popular fury threatens to overflow its banks, and to imperil the safety of the vessel of State,—*but only then*.—In ordinary times its course—smooth—passive—torpid and innocuous, must not transcend the limits of its normal sphere. From whatever source it may draw its existence, whether nominated by the Crown or elected by the people, it cannot exert, and must not be permitted to exert, a *greater* amount of control in the Parliament of Canada than is assigned to the House of Peers in the British Constitution,—that great Fabric upon which ours has been modelled, and the wisdom of which has been tested by the experience of ages;—which has so recently proved the sole barrier to European revolution and anarchy, and now stands the sheet-anchor of the liberties of the civilized world. The House of Lords, with its hereditary wealth, character, and talent and its enormous influence in the State, would not dare to invade or abridge the privileges and attributes of the House of Commons. In every contest of the kind it has invariably receded. The Legislative Council of this Province may be proud to fulfil a similar limited sphere in the destinies of Canada. The

stoppage of the supplies has been ever regarded as the harbinger of the volcano, the *ultima ratio* of an outraged people in defence of their liberties. It must ever remain the high and critical prerogative of the popular branch, and no other body in the State must be permitted to dare the dangerous ordeal. The fossil would-be revolutionary Members of our "House of Lords" ought to remember that an overweening respect for persons in high stations is not an indigenous plant on this Continent, and warned by the fate of the ambitious frog,—they must not attempt to enlarge or overstep their legitimate functions, or again play any "antics before High Heaven."

Should that body in its reformed condition ever again emit symptoms of such a tendency, it may produce a feeling of regret that in the recent change of its constitution any regard for supposed vested rights should have led to the retention of those members whose antecedents never identified them with any portion of the people, save the class of Colonial Officials who monopolized the whole patronage of the Crown as their legitimate patrimony or prey; and who had entailed upon themselves the significant distinction, at once traditionary and prophetic, of "*vieillards malveillants*." The recent enactment, passed for the purpose of ameliorating the composition of the Legislative Council, is due to the previous vicious selection of materials for that branch not in the least calculated to constitute an independent body, or a counterpoise between the Crown and the people, but of individuals altogether subservient to the will of the Executive. The Council having thus become obnoxious to the people and placed under universal ban, it was determined to substitute election by the people to nomination by the Crown, from which change it is very reasonably anticipated that its *personnel* will be improved. No one of its members, however, must for a moment imagine that its functions as a branch of the Legislature have been in the least changed or extended. The process of election places the individual elect within the bar of that House, in like manner as a similar process confers the *entrée* to the Assembly; but *there the analogy ends*. The Councillor will not carry with him one iota of that representative character which is the peculiar faculty of the Lower House. Were he allowed to do so, it would operate as a diminution, in an equal ratio, of the privileges of the latter and would at once create a constitutional anomaly.

The Councillors, like the Lords, represent their own individualities;—the Members of the Assembly the entire body of the people. The Constitution cannot tolerate two representative bodies. Their simple recognition in the State would produce a dangerous conflict, and the essential attributes of the Lower House and their imprescriptible rights and their efficiency as sole representatives of the people would be seriously impaired. In a word—the Crown with the consent of both Houses of Parliament, has surrendered a portion of its prerogative which entitled it to make appointments to the Legislative Council; but in doing so it has never been contemplated, nor can the law legally or constitutionally be tortured to intend, that the Legislative Assembly consented to abridge, or even to share with any other body or power in the State, its own peculiar attributes as guardians of the monies of the people and their *sole* representatives in Parliament,—rights for which its great prototype the House of Common has battled, and which it has maintained inviolate for centuries. It would be passing strange if an enactment which was expressly designed to impart wholesome vitality to the Members of the Legislative Council and render them more acceptable to the people, could be interpreted as investing that body with a power beyond the constitution, and thereby rendering it as king Stork, infinitely more mischievous than it had ever been as king Log, and neutralizing at the same time the most important privileges of the Lower House and paralysing the whole machine of Government. The members of the Upper House nominated by the Crown constituted the Legislative Council of Canada; elected by the people—they constitute the self-same Branch—neither more nor less. Although more independent of the Crown, and less independent of the people, they are clothed with the same powers and exercise the same functions, and they must be held—and fenced and fettered if need be—within the strict

limits of their constitutional beat. Tame submissiveness to the dictates of the Crown and mean subserviency to the caprices of the people, were the evils to be guarded against. The future character of the Council, and the peace and welfare of the Province will depend upon the wisdom of the men who are chosen. Their course will shew whether we have hit the happy medium, or the constitution has lost its balance.

It is a remarkable coincidence that this recalcitrating spirit of the Legislative Council should have been inaugurated contemporaneously with the birth in the Legislative Assembly of another monster cycloped "the double majority." Should the Upper Branch persist in their usurpation of the rights and privileges peculiar to the Lower, and arrogate to themselves a representative capacity to such a degree as to insist upon the Administration of the day being subjected to a veto in their House, it will form matter of amusement, perhaps of sorrow to contemplate the possibility of *their* being infected with this new political epidemic of a certain party in the Lower House, and the consequences which it may entail upon our administrative system. Let us figure to ourselves for a moment a ministry unable to govern the country because they cannot command *four* distinct majorities in Parliament! Such a "dead-lock" would certainly make us the "eighth" wonder of the world. Of the various dependencies of the Crown endowed with a representative constitution, Canada was the first to evolve the principle of Responsible Government, which though inherent in the constitution, had lain dormant for half a century. Should she follow in the wake of certain political demagogues of the day, she may possibly be also the first to gratify the enemies of constitutional liberty by making an exhibition of her inability to carry out or even to comprehend this system; and instead of leading the van in colonial reform, her folly may serve as a beacon to other colonies to avoid the shoals upon which we shall have made shipwreck. The seeds of discord and disunion are daily sown by reckless agitators and palmed upon the public in the shape of abstract principles of Government. Although intrinsically so impracticable as not to impose upon the veriest simpleton, their continual discussion may nevertheless tend to shew that union in the colonies is the source of weakness instead of strength, and may be a bar in the way of that more general union upon which our safety may hereafter depend. When such absurdities as the question of the "double majority" and of one Branch of the Legislature performing the functions of, and in reality representing the other, are seriously entertained and discussed by men of reputed mediocre judgment and understanding,—who, we would ask, can foresee what crude notions of government may hereafter be hatched from time to time. Everything on this continent is progressive with the exception of common sense which seems to halt and to retrograde occasionally, as a tender exotic unable to keep pace with the "tall" plants of this climate.

The new dogma of the "double majority" would seem to have started up for the express purpose of demonstrating the utter hopelessness of procuring any satisfactory or decisive conclusion from the Legislature on the question of a permanent Seat of Government, as well at the same time, fortunately, of establishing the utter nothingness of the dogma itself. For what Legislative Assembly or Council could be found to give a double majority vote in favor of any one locality in the Province. This novel doctrine of two majorities in one Legislative body, is fraught however, if suffered to germinate, with more danger to the State than we are ready to admit or can foresee at the moment. The more impracticable and incomprehensible it is, the more mischief it is likely to create. Vain and ambitious men will affect to understand and analyse it, and must therefore profess to adopt it;—wise men will look upon it with contempt; in the mean time political gamblers will make use of it for their own ends. Its mere discussion is calculated to affect injuriously as well the question of the permanent Seat of Government, as every measure of Legislation or government which may arise. In short, if adhered to, it will throw everything "off the track" and bring us back to chaos. It will be well therefore that our attention were drawn to it in due time with a

view to convince the meanest capacity of its utter inadmissibility as a guiding rule in the government of this or any other enlightened country or community under the sun.

The union of the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada was designed for the amelioration of the political condition of both. The recognition of the principle of Responsible Government was deemed a matter of necessity in order to regulate the administrative functions of the Government conformably to long established usage in England, and thereby to enable the Representative of the Sovereign, through his Executive Council selected principally from the delegates of the people, to govern the Country in a manner more congenial to the well ascertained wishes of the majority of its inhabitants, and subject to their perpetual and salutary control in the popular Branch. Assuming this as a governing principle, it is obvious that in carrying it out the Province must be considered as a political whole, and as the voice of a decided majority of the popular Branch in Parliament must to all intents and purposes be accepted as the constitutional index of the voice of the majority of the people, so also must the Executive Council be taken and considered as a whole, enjoying the confidence of the majority of the people without reference to sections, so long as they command such decided majority in Parliament. Every member of the Assembly, the instant he takes his seat in the body of that House, ceases to be the mere representative of the particular constituency by whose suffrages he has been elected a member of Parliament, a faculty with which the constitution has invested him solely for the purpose of constituting him an integral—indivisible portion of the entire representation of the Province; and should he cease by death or from any disqualifying cause to hold the office, the constituency which deputed him still continues to be legally and constitutionally represented equally as much as if he had not lost his seat, subject only to a diminution of that representation in the ratio of one to one hundred and thirty, a defect which the constituency in question shares in common with all the others whose delegates continue to retain their seats. Theoretically this principle is undeniable, and in practice it is manifest that no other can be safely acted upon without derangement of the whole fabric of the constitution, in as much as if the administrative functions of the Government, which of themselves in effect absorb the entire essence of the constitution, are not exercised and maintained in their integrity and with rigid adhesion to the principle that the majority must rule the minority, the constitution would relapse into the state of paralysis in which it languished before a healthful action was imparted to it by the application of the principle of the responsibility of the members of the Cabinet to the people. Although the inhabitants of the two sections constituting the Province of Canada differ widely in language, laws and religion, nevertheless politically they constitute but one people, and the majority, as in all countries enjoying representative institutions, must legislate for the minority, always of course with an equal and undeviating regard to the rights of all. The French and Catholic majority of Lower Canada, and the English and Protestant majority of Upper Canada, legislated for their respective minorities before the Union without any jarring of the constitution, and generally with due respect for the rights and privileges of their respective minorities.

But the most conclusive argument in proof of the necessity of dealing with the inhabitants of the two sections and their Representatives in Parliament, as well as the Executive Council of their choice—each in their respective spheres—as one whole, is derived from the self evident truth that any other administrative system which is based upon sectional divisions is utterly impracticable. Let us review the consequences of the application of the double majority system. If it should happen for instance upon the vote in the Legislative Assembly of a fair working majority of the whole House in favor of the Administration of the day, that a majority of the Representatives of Upper Canada is found *against* the Government side of the measure, the members of the Administration elected in Upper Canada must, upon the "double majority" principle, take such vote as declaratory by Upper Canada of its want of con-

fidence in the Government, and thereupon retire from office. Then—precisely as the converse of the same proposition,—the members from Lower Canada, having a majority as well of their own section as of the whole House, are entitled to consider the same vote as an expression of confidence in *them* and by consequence to retain their offices. Usually when the Premier as Head of the Government resigns his office, his Government is thereby broken up, and the individual selected by the Crown to form a new Administration has all the portfolios at his disposal. But in the application of the double majority system, when, for instance, the deficit is in the Upper Canada side, and the Premier happens to be an Upper Canada Member of the Government, the Upper Canada section of the Administration must *all* retire carrying the Premier along with them, while the Lower Canada section remains in office, thus exhibiting the strange inconsistency in practice of the retirement of the Premier in *one* instance dissolving the entire Government, while in the *other* the resignation of the same important political chief, together with half his Government, only rivets the other half more firmly in office by virtue of the same identical vote which entails the dismissal of the former!

Should the double majority principle be constitutionally applicable in the administration of the Government of two Provinces united in one, it must also be the governing rule in the case of the union of three or more Provinces, and in such cases the Ministry of the day must command a majority of the Members of each of the three or more united Provinces. No sooner is such an hypothesis suggested to the mind than it explodes amidst the ridicule which it calls up. If a line of distinction is to be drawn between Upper and Lower Canada as two separate political entities, there is no determining to what number of subdivisions the rule is to be applied. If for instance it were the case of Lower Canada alone in the enjoyment of Responsible Government, and that all the Members from the District of Montreal withdrew their confidence from the Government, it would be necessary upon the same principle that all the Members of the Administration from that District (if any there happened to be,) should at once resign. If not—where is the constitutional line of demarcation to be drawn? Then again, although sound policy and equal justice require that the Administration should be composed in equal parts of Upper and Lower Canada Members of Parliament, there is no constitutional necessity for such a composition of the Cabinet. The majority, or indeed the entire Government may be selected from one section;—and in case of any such disparity, which, though highly improbable, is neither impossible nor unconstitutional, what rule is to be followed with respect to a vote of want of confidence expressed by that section which is unrepresented in the Government? For, however absurd the supposed consequence, the rule, if sound in principle, must be applicable to all possible emergencies. The more we attempt to carry out this governmental doctrine the more paradoxical it becomes, and there is no end to the absurdities to which it may lead us.

The first innovation of this character occurred in 1851, when the Hon. Robert Baldwin, Attorney General for Upper Canada, resigned his office and seat in the Cabinet, in consequence of a vote of the House upon the Court of Chancery which gave a large majority to the Government, but in which a majority of Upper Canadians were found in the opposition. The unconstitutionality of this act of resignation in the face of a large majority of Mr. Baldwin's Government was practically brought home to the breasts of the supporters of the Government from Lower Canada who gave him that majority, and who felt that their votes were treated as nugatory and valueless.

But it is said that we must not govern Upper Canada by a Lower Canada majority, and *vice versâ*. There is a fundamental error in speaking at all of an *Upper* Canada majority or a *Lower* Canada majority. The premises assumed are based upon a constitutional fallacy, and no legitimate conclusion can be drawn from them.

In the event of our being driven to submit to the double majority system and that the Government of the day, while sustained by a majority of the whole House,

have the misfortune to encounter an adverse vote from the majority of the Members either of Upper or Lower Canada, and that this sectional derangement is to be deemed a constitutional impediment, they must dissolve Parliament and appeal to the country, notwithstanding that from the usual legitimate diagnoses in such matters they may be perfectly justified in assuming that their policy—already approved by a majority of the House, is also in accordance with the views of the people. They would thus exhibit to the world the singular anomaly of a Government dissolving a Parliament in which they possessed a fair working majority; and this for the purpose—not of sending the entire popular Branch to their constituents for approval or disapproval, but of trying a trivial *Nisi Prius* issue with some ten or twelve Members out of a House of one hundred and thirty, who from some motives of ambition or self-interest have seceded from their party and gone grumblingly into opposition. They would also by the same course most unjustly subject all the members of the section of the majority, and a great many members of the section of the minority, as well as their most unoffending constituencies, to the vexatious and harrassing ordeal of a general election, merely because a *minority* who could not under such circumstances scarcely ever exceed one fourth of the whole representatives, are hostile to the Government. Instead of thus succumbing, very possibly in the midst of a Session, to the designs of a few factionists, and at “one fell swoop” sending to the “tomb of all the Capulets” a variety of important measures maturing before Parliament, and which might have already received the sanction of an undisputed majority of both sections, a sane policy would suggest the propriety of bringing public opinion to bear on the recalcitrants, in order to prevent their ever again attempting to arrogate to themselves the power of disarranging the whole machinery of Government, and destroying the efficacy of Parliament by rendering it subservient to the caprice or the venality of a few discontents. In all popularly constituted Governments the majority *must* prevail and constrain the minority, whether it be in Conventions, at the Hustings, in Legislative Bodies or Parish meetings. This is the essence of responsible or constitutional Government. When the Crown can no longer command a majority in the Assembly of the People’s delegates, it dissolves the House and the People decide the issue at the Polls. If a section of the House put the Government in a minority, and that the double majority notion is to be tolerated or essayed, then there is but one cure for the evil which may be worse than the disease, the Governor must have the power to *dissolve the section*!! Should the views of the section be triumphant the Government will find itself just where it was—beautifully balanced and neutralized, thus shewing that the whole thing has reached what the mathematicians call a *reductio ad absurdum*, and—lashed by the lessons of experience—we must retrace our steps. If we refuse to give the power to dissolve the section, then, as already stated, we commit a gross act of oppression towards the section of the majority and place the majority of the House at the mercy of the minority. Scylla or Charybdis! It were better to throw the “double majority” “notions” overboard into the vortex and return to port for more ballast. The instant you confer the power on the minority to fetter the action or arrest the course of the majority, you must go elsewhere for a constitution.

Should the future proceedings of the Council betray a *second* attempt to coerce the popular Branch, either directly or indirectly, into the rejection of any measure appertaining to its own exclusive jurisdiction, and which it had previously sanctioned, or into the adoption of any policy of the same nature which it had already repudiated,—by intermeddling with its final and solemn disposition of the people’s monies;—should any portion of its Members—under the pernicious influence of the old leaven, or intoxicated with the notion that they possess some imaginary—undefined representative capacity, venture to supersede or embarrass the functions of the Legislative Assembly, they will produce a conflict which may be fatal to their own existence. The people of Canada are resolved to preserve their Constitution intact, and will not blindly abandon the fruits of the victory achieved by the introduction of Responsible Government. It is said that “to be forewarned is to be

forearmed." The first attempt of the Council to poach upon the domain of the people and thereby to mar the harmonious action of the constitution, must be crushed in the bud. But if persisted in—the shout of an aroused and indignant people will be "*à la lanterne*" with the offending excrecence; their political existence—individual and collective—will be snapped by the fiat of an avenging public, and the "crack of doom" will ring in their ears ere they be again allowed to have an opportunity of trampling upon the sacred rights of the people.

Among the advantages which have recently eminently enhanced the eligibility of Quebec on the score of salubrity may be mentioned its magnificent Aqueduct, unequalled in power by that of any City on the globe. The Town is supplied, without limitation as to quantity, from the *Château d'Eau* constructed on the River St. Charles at the Village of Lorette, nine miles from Quebec, at an elevation capable of discharging the pellucid waters of Lake St. Charles at the height of *one hundred feet* above the top of the Flag Staff on the citadel, and of completely inundating the highest building in the City with a force surpassing that of the most improved Fire Engine on "the most improved principle of modern invention," and affording, at the same time, a facility of drainage and sewerage altogether inappreciable. Compare the means of cleanliness of such a City and its purified atmosphere—in the heart of a mountainous region,—having its shores laved twice in twenty-four hours by the ocean swell which upheaves the broad Atlantic,—with the tropical climates of more inland cities, situate in champagne countries scarcely broken by a single undulation of mother earth. In vain do the inhabitants of these look round for the commanding altitude of a St. Charles or a Montmorency to furnish the means of cooling their incandescent streets and pavements. In vain—ruminating upon the borders of their low marshes and swamps—do they fancy that they overlook, or affect to *look down* upon the promontory of Cape Diamond. In vain, are they surrounded or bathed by mighty rivers and lakes, most of them the fruitful source of perennial aches and agues. These inland seas would furnish an everlasting deluge for the wants of the inhabitants, could they first reverse or overcome the laws of gravitation, and invert the established order of things to the same degree that they violate the dictates of reason and common sense in their labours to depreciate the position of Quebec and puff up their own sultry or humid localities as eligible sites for the permanent Seat of the Government of Canada.

Amidst all the plotting and intriguing against the City of Quebec in and out of Parliament by persons actuated by interested motives, and utterly reckless of the general welfare of the Province; amidst all the manœuvring of political adventurers seeking to make capital out of the prejudices and the selfish views of the inhabitants of particular localities, the most unscrupulous of these advocates of *outré* popular notions,—whose career is stereotyped in acts of political fraud and imposture, have not dared to enter into a comparative estimate of the eligibility of the various rival Cities. They have restricted their comments and their strictures to the one oft repeated assertion that Quebec is situate at one *extremity* of the Province,—an objection which every schoolboy knows to be unfounded. Quebec is distant some five hundred miles from the eastern, and about seven hundred and fifty from the western limits of United Canada. The sources of wealth derivable from numerous and valuable water powers for manufacturers, and rich and inexhaustible fisheries in Eastern Canada, are incalculable; while the means of settlement of the western Section, extensive and fertile though they be, have yet a visible limit assigned to them. Political jugglers and empirics may continue to predict and declaim that in a given number of years, the population of the Upper Province will far outnumber that of the Lower; but our wants and obligations are with the present, leaving the future to the course of events, and the dispensation of a Higher Power of which the dogmatical charlatans of the hour do not even pretend to know any thing. Unless we assume that the rights of the vast population inhabiting the northeastern and less congenial portion of the Province are to be utterly disregarded, we cannot with any semblance of justice establish the Seat of Government permanently in a place infinitely less accessible to them than to their

more fortunate and prosperous bretheren of the west. The journey from Labrador or Gaspé to Quebec, is yet a matter of several days, if not of weeks, while that from the upper limits of the Province, is but a question of a few hours. The writer left Windsor, the western limit, on Monday, the 14th of July, at 10½ A. M., and reached Quebec on the following day, at 10½ P. M.,—thus accomplishing the distance of seven hundred and fifty miles in *thirty six hours*. In the face of such a fact will those who incessantly "deblaterate" to their dupes about the remote position of the ancient Capital of the Province, presume to impugn its eligibility on the ground of its want of centrality? Will they continue to reiterate this deception from day to day in their veracious mouth-pieces, and exhibit to the world a perverse adherence to error, which can only be sustained on the assumed ignorance of those whom they address, and whose monies they filch in return.

The Assembly is split up by sectional interests on this disturbing question. The Cabinet, which is constitutionally the reflex of the policy of the Representatives of the people, cannot possibly be united when its source is so extensively schismatic, and must of necessity leave this an open question. The Representative of the Sovereign thus deprived of his Council cannot act. There seems to be but one issue to the present dilemma. The matter must revert to the parent authority. The question is one palpably of an imperial and not of a colonial character. The ultimate object can only be best attained, without damaging or embarrassing the position of any member of the Executive Government or of the Legislature, by an address to the Councils of the Empire praying them to resume, that of which they ought never even partially to have divested themselves, the determination of the fittest place for the permanent Seat of the Government of Canada, with a single eye to the integrity of the Empire and the fundamental and permanent interests of the Province.

Under such circumstances let the inhabitants of the City and District of Quebec rouse from their lethargy; let them for once break the chrysalis of their proverbial apathy, and carry a respectful representation to the Throne, setting forth fairly and impartially the grounds upon which they claim the preference for Quebec, and at the same time challenge every other rival locality in Canada to do the same. Let them not by their supineness damage the vantage ground which they have recently rightly and justly acquired, nor be deterred by the insidious accusations of their enemies,—that they are moved by self-interest. Each and all of the aspiring localities are equally so moved, with this preeminent advantage in favor of Quebec, that its position is justified by a host of unanswerable arguments enabling it to laugh to scorn all the disingenuous imputations of its competitors, while they are abashed by the total absence of any rational grounds to prop their pretensions.

Quebec and the surrounding District are inhabited by a peaceful, moral and loyal population. The demon of intolerance has never yet disturbed the general tenor of their social relations. The great mass of the inhabitants, composed of numberless sects, dwell together as christians. This amiable characteristic of our people is as universally known and recognized as the geographical position of the country. There is not an individual of standing in Lower Canada who would stake his reputation upon a contrary assertion. The French and Catholic Legislature of Lower Canada gave—years ago—a lasting proof of their christian charity by conceding equal rights to their fellow subjects the Jews—an example which has yet to be followed by that great philanthropic Nation of which they are but a dependency. The proportion of Protestant Members in the Assembly, is greatly in excess of the aggregate of that class of the inhabitants, and several constituencies composed entirely, or for the greater part of French Canadian Roman Catholics, are represented by Protestant Members, who in some instances have obtained the suffrages of the people against French Canadian residents of the County,—the choice almost in every contest depending—liberally and magnanimously—upon the known political principles of the candidates. The Roman Catholic majority of Lower Canada, respecting the scruples of

the Protestant minority, willingly grant them separate schools; the Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada, actuated by the same conscientious scruples in regard to the education of their youth, have with great difficulty extorted the same privilege from the Protestant majority of that Section, among whom a horde of fanatics yet move heaven and earth to wrest this privilege from them, and to re-enact the former odious inequality of religious rights. The Roman Catholic dignitaries of Lower Canada, in their public mandates to their own people, ever make mention of Protestants by the highly christian designation of "*nos frères séparés*." Our Protestant champions when they fulminate, generally carry out the principles of their Great Master by speaking of their fellow christians as "*bigots and idolaters*," and interlarding their observations with the elegant and respectful terms of "Romish" and "Popish," and every other offensive epithet which can be gleaned from the vocabulary of the worst times of religious persecution and intolerance. When, therefore, certain religious and dishonest political zealots, with the machiavelish design of depreciating the character of Quebec in the eyes of the people of Upper Canada, hazard the bold and lying assertion, that the City of Quebec is the seat of popery, and that its population of all origins are held in bondage by the Roman Catholic Priesthood, the mind of every honorable man, whether Catholic or Protestant, revolts at the calumny as the culminating point of brazen impudence and mendacity.

Whenever the Imperial Government decides which place in Canada is to be the permanent Seat of Government, all contention and rivalry on the subject will immediately cease. The various sections of the Assembly who are now constrained to maintain, against their judgment and their conscience, the candidature of localities which they know to be utterly defenceless, will rejoice to be relieved from the embarrassment of such a position. The attention of both Houses will be directed to the discharge of those duties to which the constitution and their oaths have called them. That harmony which is so essential to these ends will be restored to the Legislative Assembly; for it is a matter of notoriety that on every occasion on which this monstrous question has surged up, the landmarks of political parties, and the efficiency of the preponderating party in the House, were completely shattered, and invariably gave place to that extravagant zeal for sectional interests which Members displayed, or conceived themselves compelled to affect, and to that undignified rancour which is the usual concomitant of such a state of things. The tenure of office of the party in power, whoever they may be, and however otherwise acceptable to the majority of the people, will be rendered very precarious if they be doomed to be assailed from Session to Session by the turmoil caused by a subject upon which it is hopeless to expect that any Administration can be unanimous.

In whatever light then this question is to be regarded; whether in respect to the abstract point of the superior eligibility of any one place, or its damaging effect upon the Queen's Government in this Province, all parties unite in demanding, and every reason presses for its speedy adjustment. Should however the Metropolitan authorities—carrying a little too far their indisposition (otherwise judicious and praiseworthy) to intermeddle in Colonial affairs, still decline to exercise the Royal Prerogative in this matter, and be unwilling to assume the responsibility of governing a Colony with that firmness which ought to preside at the helm of State in regard to all points strictly within their competence, more particularly one of so urgent and important a character as the key to their Empire on this continent, let them—in default of any other mode of decision, appoint a commission of competent persons to determine once for all, which is the most eligible place—all things considered—for the permanent Seat of Government in this Province. Such a commission might be composed of an experienced Officer of the Line, an Officer of Engineers and a British Statesman, to be selected by the Home Government, together with two Members of the Provincial Parliament, one from Upper and one from Lower Canada, to be chosen by the Governor General.

In so far as Quebec is concerned, and whatever be the mode of adjustment, it

will be no herculean task to establish to the satisfaction of our gracious Sovereign and the enlightened Statesmen of England, as well as of every rational and unprejudiced being from Dan to Beersheba, that the interests and the permanent welfare of the City of Cape Diamond, as well as of the Canadas and the sister Provinces, and indeed of the Empire at large, are as one upon this great question, and that any error committed now in the choice of the permanent Seat of Government of the Canadas, may be fatal to the prosperity and jeopardise the safety of one and all of them.

Quebec, August, 1856.

MEMBERS WHO VOTED FOR QUEBEC :

Hon. Messrs. Taché,
Quesnel,
Bouret,
Ross,
Panet,
Belleau,
Armstrong,
Cartier,
Perry,—(9.)

AGAINST QUEBEC :

Hon. Messrs. De Blaquièrre,
Crooks,
Ferguson,
Hamilton,
Ferrie,
Goodhue,
Morris,
Gordon,
Matthieson,
Bolton,
Seymour,
Dickson,—(12.)

ABSENT :

Hon. Messrs. McGill,
Caron,
McCaulay,
Mills,
Dionne,
Walker,
Irving,
Boucherville,
Widmer,
Pinhey,
Ferrier,
Viger,
Leslie,
De Beaujeu,
Methot,
Wilson,
Turgeon.

Members who advocated and voted for a permanent Seat of Government "in any place between Penetanguishine and Anticosti"! and who, when they had prevailed upon a majority of the House to vote with them, voted against Quebec after the sense of the House had been pronounced in its favor by a majority of ten,—a very large one on such a question :

	<i>Times.</i>
Messrs. Bell,	U. C.,—2.
Church,	" —2.
Crawford,	" —1.
Crysler,	" —1.
Daly,	" —1.
DeLong,	" —1.
Ferrie,	" —1.
Macdonald J. S.,	" —1.
Macdonald R.,...	" —1.
Mattice,	" —1.
McCann,	" —2.
Patrick,	" —2.
Powell,	" —1.
Rankin,	" —2.
Shaw,	" —1.
(16)—Yeilding,	" —1.
Darche,	L. C.,—1.
Ferres,	" —1.
Holton,	" —2.
Rhodes,	" —0.—(Absent.)
Sanborn,	" —1.
Somerville,	" —2.
Terrill,	" —1.
(8)—Young,	" —1.

(24)

DIVISIONS IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

NAMES.	17 Mar '56.		17 Mar '56.		14 Aprl '56.		14 Aprl '56.		16 Aprl '56.		16 Aprl '56.	
	Prmanency postpone for this session.		Postpone for estimates.		Prmanency postpone for this session.		Perma- nency.		Quebec agt Hamilton.		Quebec agt Toronto.	
	For	Agt	For	Agt	For	Agt	For	Agt	For	Agt	For	Agt
Aikins	1		1		1			1		1		1
Alleyne	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Bell		1		1		1	1			1		1
Bellingham		1		1		1				1		1
Biggar	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Bourassa				1		1	1	1		1		1
Bowes	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Brodeur		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Brown	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Bureau		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Burton		1		1								
Cameron	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Cartier		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Casault	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Cauchon	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Cayley	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Chabot	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Chapais	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Chisholm				1		1		1		1		1
Chrystie	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Church		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Clarke	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Conger		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Cook	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Cooke		1		1		1		1		1		1
Crawford		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Crysler	1					1	1			1		1
Daly		1		1		1	1			1		1
Daoust, C.	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Daoust, J. B.	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Darche		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Delong		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Désaulniers				1		1	1	1		1		1
De Witt	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Dionne	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Dorion, A. A.		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Dorion, J. B. E.		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Dostaler		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Drummond		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Dufresne		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Egan						1	1	1		1		1
Evanturel	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Felton		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Fergusson				1		1	1	1		1		1
Ferres		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Ferri		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Foley		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Fortier, O. C.	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Fortier, Thos	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Fournier	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Frazer	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Freeman				1			1	1		1		1
Galt		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Gamble	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Gill		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Gould				1		1	1	1		1		1
Guevremont		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Hartman	1		1		1		1	1		1		1
Holton		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Hnot		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Jackson		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Jobin		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Labelle		1		1		1	1	1		1		1
Laberge		1		1		1	1	1		1		1

MBLY

ON THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.

Aprl '56.

Quebec
agt
Toronto.

For Agt

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

16 April '56

Quebec
agt
Kingston.

For Agt

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

16 April '56

Quebec
agt
Montreal.

For Agt

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

16 April '56.

Quebec
agt
Ottawa.

For Agt

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

16 April '56.

U. Canada
agt
L. Canada.

For Agt

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

16 April '56.

Final Vote
for
Quebec.

For Agt

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

25 June '56.

Ottawa
agt
Montreal.

For Agt

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

25 June 1856.

To rescind vote
in favor of Que-
bec and insert
Montreal.

For Agt

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

25 June '56.

Vote
on
£50,000.

For Agt

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

1

DIVISIONS IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

NAMES.	17 Mar' '56 — Prmanency postponefor this session		17 Mar' '56. — Postpone for estimates.		14 April '56. — Prmanency postponefor this session.		14 April '56 — Perma- nency.		16 April '56. — Quebec agt Hamilton		16 April '56. — Quebec agt Toronto.	
	For	Agt	For	Agt	For	Agt	For	Agt	For	Agt	For	Agt
Laporte.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Larwill.....	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	
Le Bouthillier.....	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	
Lemieux.....	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	
Loranger.....		1		1		1	1	1	1		1	
Lumsden.....	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	
Lyon (Fellows).....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Macbeth.....	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	
Macdonald, Atty. Gen.....	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	
Macdonald, J. S.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Macdonald, R.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Mackenzie.....	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	
Marchildon.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Masson.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Mathieson.....	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	
Mattice.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
McCann.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Meagher.....	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	
Merritt.....	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	
Mongenais.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Morrison, A.....	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	
Morrison, J. C.....	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	
Munro.....	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	
Murney.....		1		1					1		1	
Niles.....	1		1		1		1		1		1	
O'Farrell.....	1		1					1	1		1	
Papin.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Patrick.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Polette.....	1		1						1		1	
Poulin.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Pouliot.....	1		1		1		1	1	1		1	
Powell.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Prevost.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Price.....	1		1			1	1		1		1	
Rankin.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Rhodes.....	1		1			1	1		1		1	
Robinson.....	1		1		1		1		1		1	
Roblin.....		1		1			1		1		1	
Rulph.....	1		1		1		1		1		1	
Ross, Sol. Gen.....	1		1		1		1		1		1	
Ross, Jas.....	1		1		1		1		1		1	
Sanborn.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Scutcherd.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Shaw.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Smith, Sol. Gen.....	1		1		1		1		1		1	
Smith, Jas.....	1		1		1		1		1		1	
Smith, Sid.....		1		1								
Somerville.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Southwick.....		1		1		1	1					
Spence.....	1		1		1		1		1		1	
Stevenson.....	1		1		1		1		1		1	
Supple.....						1	1		1		1	
Taché.....	1		1			1	1		1		1	
Terrill.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Thibaudeau.....				1		1	1		1		1	
Turcotte.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Valois.....		1		1					1		1	
Whitney.....				1		1	1		1		1	
Wilson.....	1		1		1		1		1		1	
Wright.....	1		1		1		1		1		1	
Yeilding.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
Young.....		1		1		1	1		1		1	
	53	62	63	58	53	65	64	54	70	46	71	50

16 April '56.

[illegible]

ERRATUM.

In the column of Members who voted for Permanency and afterwards against Quebec Mr. RHODES has been inserted by error. He voted on every division *in favor* of Quebec, except the one from which he was absent.
